CATHOLICITY

Conciones ad Clerum

By T. A. LACEY, M.A.

THE PROPERTY OF
TRINITY CHURCH

CATHOLICITY

Conciones ad Clerum

BY

T. A. LACEY, M.A.

Author of "Consciousness of God," "The Mysteries of Grace," "Liturgical Interpolations"

περὶ τῶν μηδέπω βλεπομένων

A. R. MOWBRAY & CO. LTD.
LONDON: 28 Margaret Street, Oxford Circus, W.
OXFORD: 9 High Street
MILWAUKEE, U.S.A.: THE YOUNG CHURCHMAN CO.

First impression, 1914

ΤΟΙΣ . ΠΡΕΣΒΥΤΕΡΟΙΣ
ΤΗΣ . ΕΝ . ΒΕΡΜΙΓΓΟΙΣ . ΚΑΘΟΛΙΚΗΣ
ΕΚΚΛΗΣΙΑΣ

PREFACE

THESE four lectures were addressed to the clergy of Birmingham and the neighbourood, at the Church of St. Jude in that city, uring the Lent of last year. They are pubshed almost exactly as delivered; but in some ıses a little expansion has relieved, I hope, an bscurity that was due to compression. More ıan eighty of my brethren did me the honour f listening continuously to discourses which ertainly demanded, if they did not merit, very ose attention; and I hope that others may nd them not altogether unuseful in their ublished form.

To the lectures I have appended two essays, sed elsewhere, which may serve for illustraon. The first has not been published before; ıe other I am allowed to retrieve from the olumns of the *Church Times*, enlarging it ightly on the way.

January 14, 1914.

CONTENTS

AP.		PAGE
I.	THE WORD AND THE IDEA - - - -	1
II.	THE ORGANIC ELEMENT - - - -	30
III.	THE DOGMATIC ELEMENT - - - -	60
IV.	THE ELEMENT OF LARGENESS - - -	90
PPENDIX A.	CATHEDRA PETRI - - - -	117
PPENDIX B.	SECURUS IUDICAT ORBIS TERRARUM -	135

CATHOLICITY

I

THE WORD AND THE IDEA

WE believe in the Catholic Church; we profess the Catholic Faith; we call ourselves Catholics. What do we mean? What is Catholicity?

It is never safe to discuss an idea in terms of etymology. We are dependent on words for expression, and a word is usually chosen to express an idea with some reference to its etymological sense; but it becomes set, or polarized as Wendell Holmes would say, in a fashion that gives it a conventional meaning. Where this has been done it is merely misleading to hark back to its origin, and to use it with deceptive purism in the etymological sense. The depolarization of theological terms, which Holmes with some reason demanded, is

not a study in archaeology ; it is the examination of words in common use, for the purpose of finding out what the users really mean, and the occasional substitution of an unusual equivalent for the purpose of accentuating the sense. We cannot determine the meaning of Catholicity by the study of Greek adjectives and prepositions.

Yet in this case there is something to be gained from that study. We are investigating an idea which has a history ; and in history it is well to begin with the beginning ; not, as in poetry, to plunge *in medias res*. The Christians of the first age found in use—perhaps in common use, and sufficiently established in literature—a Greek word which seemed to them suitable for describing the Church of Christ. They called the Church καθολική. How soon the word found its way into a baptismal creed cannot be ascertained ; it is used familiarly in one of the Epistles of St. Ignatius and in the *Martyrium Polycarpi*. In the first of these places the meaning is quite clear, though the word has been perversely interpreted. It is a favourite contention of St. Ignatius that the bishop is the head of the Church in each several locality, and he

emphasizes this by a comparison, ὥσπερ ὅπου ἂν ᾖ Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς ἐκεῖ ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία.[1] The Catholic Church is, then, the whole Church, as distinct from the part of the Church locally organized. We are thrown back to the language of St. Paul, who could speak of the Church as one and undivided, and yet could name "the Church which is in Corinth," or "the Churches of Judaea." The Catholic Church is the Church regarded as one and indivisible. In this sense the word had long been current. For Polybius καθολικὴ καὶ κοινὴ ἱστορία was general history as distinct from that of particular states.[2]

The *Martyrium* has the word three times in the same sense, made the more emphatic by explicatory additions. In the inscription, "the Church of God dwelling in (παροικοῦσα) Smyrna," addresses "the Church of God dwelling in Philomelium and all the habitations (παροικίαις) of the holy and Catholic Church in every place." In the eighth chapter Polycarp is described as praying for "the whole Catholic Church throughout the world (οἰκουμένην)." In the nineteenth chapter is the same description of the Church as shepherded

[1] Smyrn. 8. [2] Polyb. 8. 4, 11.

by the Lord Jesus Christ. But in the sixteenth chapter the word is found in a very different sense. Polycarp is here called ἐπίσκοπος τῆς ἐν Σμύρνῃ καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας.[1] The local Church itself is called Catholic. Evidently, then, the word has another sense different from that in which it is used to distinguish the whole Church from its several parts. What does it mean here?

There is another question. In which sense —if there be none other—does the baptismal creed use the word? I would have you observe that the Greek term was taken over in the Latin version of the creed. Why? The Slavonic translators made a literal rendering of the Greek, as the construction of their language allowed. In modern times the Scandinavian Lutherans, and some Germans, have done the like. They have been accused, perhaps unreasonably, of an heretical intention; but *allgemeine* is an almost exact equivalent of καθολική as used by St. Ignatius, and if that is the meaning of the word in the creed, the

[1] I think that Funk has successfully defended this reading against the alternative ἁγίας, preferred by Lightfoot. Otherwise, my argument drawn from this use of the word καθολικὸς must wait for the date of the Muratorian Fragment.

rendering is justified. But is that the whole meaning? Why did not the Latins use a native word? *Universalis ecclesia* would be a sufficient rendering of the Ignatian phrase, and would have the authority of Quinctilian; *generalis ecclesia* would do equally well, and this word from the time of Cicero had been the accepted equivalent of the Greek term as used in philosophy. But no such word would fit "the Catholic Church in Smyrna." Shall we infer that the word is used in the creed as in this phrase, and that no Latin equivalent could be found? The conclusion would be too large. But it seems probable that it was not narrowed to either sense exclusively, and was therefore taken over intact, there being no Latin equivalent that would cover its various shades of meaning. You must bear in mind that the borrowing was not without precedent or exclusively ecclesiastical. Pliny spoke of the *catholica siderum errantium*,[1] the general properties of the planets. The Greek word was wider than any of native growth; it was therefore convenient, and passed into common use. I need not remind you that by the time of Tertullian it had lost all foreign

[1] *Hist. Nat.* ii. 15.

savour, but it may be as well to point out that he could still use it in a sense not quite technical, as when he spoke of the *bonitas Dei catholica*.[1] One seems to be hearing the language of English newspapers.

I return to the *Martyrium Polycarpi*, and ask in what sense the Church in Smyrna could be called Catholic. Another use of the word, earlier or contemporary, will occur to you. What are the "Catholic Epistles" of the canon of the New Testament? They are not all addressed to the whole Church universally. The inclusion of the extremely particular second and third of St. John under this head shows that the cataloguing was not very precise; but it may be said broadly that the rest of these writings were so called because they were not addressed to one particular Church, but to many. The word *Catholic* could be used, then, with a certain limited extension. Can we say that "the Catholic Church of Smyrna" means the whole body of Christians in the city and neighbourhood, as distinct from any several congregations that may have existed?

The interpretation is tempting; the use of

[1] *Adv. Marcion.* ii. 17.

such a phrase in connexion with the episcopate fits in with the insistence on the importance of the bishop as centre of unity which characterizes the letters of St. Ignatius, and which within a century became the constant burden of St. Cyprian's teaching. Reference has been made to the fifty-ninth canon of the Council in Trullo forbidding the celebration of Baptism in oratories or anywhere else than in "catholic churches" — ταῖς καθολικαῖς προσερχέσθωσαν ἐκκλησίαις—which are taken to be the mother-churches of cities. The Lateran basilica, with its unique baptistery, was at Rome *mater et magistra omnium ecclesiarum*. But the Council in Trullo is too late to help us, nor is the term used strictly comparable with that which we are examining. You may possibly find it much earlier in the well-known challenge addressed by St. Augustine to the Donatists. He imagines a stranger in a town asking *Ubi est catholica?* Would any Donatists venture to direct him to their own place of assembly? The argument is not subtle enough, and the play on the word evidently intended is lost, if we suppose the inquirer to be asking for a Catholic as distinct from an heretical or schismatic place of worship;

it seems probable that in Africa the principal church of a place was familiarly called the Catholica, the general place of worship for the Christians of the neighbourhood. But, as I have said, this meaning does not fit the passage in the *Martyrium*. We cannot suppose that ἐκκλησία is here used of a building in which Polycarp presided.

This later usage, therefore, does not support the contention that the Church of Smyrna is called Catholic in the sense of a precise and limited extension embracing all the faithful within a given circumscription. Nor is there any trace elsewhere of such an use of the word. This interpretation, therefore, must be laid aside.

Another may engage our attention for a moment. From the fifth century onward we find the title Καθολικὸς occasionally applied to a patriarch or exarch. The Armenians use it to this day for their chief prelate. Can we suppose the Church of Smyrna in the second century to have been called Catholic as having an eminent position among the Churches of Asia? It is impossible. In the first place the title Καθολικὸς seems to have been rather civil than ecclesiastical in origin.

It was borne by the chief financial officer of one of the larger divisions of the empire as organized by Diocletian. He was, in fact, Receiver General. The etymological analogy of this English title must not be pressed too far, because there is an important difference. In English, proper terms of philosophy are let down to a loose significance in the popular speech; in Greek the philosophers took words of common life, and gave them a precise significance for their special purpose. The result, however, is much the same, and in both cases we must guard ourselves against fallacious reasoning from the popular to the technical sense. The Καθολικὸς of the civil administration bore a dignified title of no precise significance, and it may well have been borrowed for ecclesiastical use. But even if the ecclesiastical title be otherwise accounted for, it will not help us here. There is no ground for supposing that in the second century the Bishop of Smyrna enjoyed anything resembling a metropolitical dignity. This interpretation also must be set aside.

There is a third interpretation to be dismissed. Was the Church of Smyrna called Catholic because it was an integral part

of the whole Catholic Church? At a later date this seemed to be a natural use of the word, as it does to-day; but that was because a secondary sense, in which *catholic* stood opposed to *heretic*, had become dominant. We must not throw this development back to the second century, though the first step towards it may have been taken; and, so long as the word was used with a dominating consciousness of its primary meaning, it would have been mere verbal jugglery to call a particular Church Catholic precisely because of its relation to that which was properly Catholic. It would be calling a part the whole because it was a part. This will not do.

What remains? You will observe that the Smyrniote presbyters call the whole Church of God, and their own local Church, alike Catholic, without qualification, without explanation, without apology. Both uses of the word are evidently familiar. They are familiar not only at Smyrna, but also at Philomelium and doubtless throughout Asia. It seems in the highest degree improbable that an epithet on which much stress seems to have been laid should be applied simultaneously to the same

substantive in two entirely disparate senses. Accept that, and you will look for some meaning in the epithet which will fit both the Church at large and the particular local Church. But the meaning of mere geographical extension will not fit the local Church; therefore there must be something more than this in the word, when it is applied to the Church at large. It does signify geographical extension, and that meaning is pressed, but it signifies something else as well.

Now look at the inscription of the letter. Twice in the body of their communication the Smyrniotes call the whole Church Catholic, with insistence on its universality alone; but in the inscription they describe it in a single phrase as "holy and catholic:" *πάσαις ταῖς κατὰ πάντα τόπον τῆς ἁγίας καὶ καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας παροικίαις.* Here also the note of universality is pressed; but, if nothing more than geographical extension is intended, does it not seem frigid to couple with this the note of holiness? Remember that these men were not using a compound phrase consecrated by centuries of repetition in the Creed. They were themselves helping to form the language of Christendom. You may be sure that when

the Church was first called in a breath Holy and Catholic the two epithets were not without congruity.

Yet the Church was certainly called Catholic because of its extension. True; but if the extension of the Church was due to some interior quality, then the savour of that quality would easily communicate itself to the word by which the extension was described. The Church would be called Catholic, not merely because it was world-wide, but because there was something in it which made it world-wide. And the quality making for universal extension might well be one that could be coupled not incongruously with holiness. Moreover this quality, being diffused throughout the Church, could be recognized, like holiness, in each several local Church, which might therefore be called Catholic. The Church of Smyrna was Catholic for the same reason that the whole Church was Catholic—because it had in itself the quality that makes for world-wide extension.

I may seem to have deduced much from few words in the *Martyrium Polycarpi*, but I think the process has been sound, and the conclusion has a value. It shows why

Christians of the Latin language took over the Greek word, calling the Church *catholica*, and passed it on to other languages. It accounts for later uses of the word in which it came to stand for all that is sound and orthodox in doctrine or practice, as against the vagaries of heresy. It enables us to understand why St. Augustine could say that on his conversion he became *Christianus catholicus*. The word has sunk to baser uses, being made a mere badge, sometimes of nothing better than a party; but even for this abuse there is seen to be some reason. All this development would be irrational and arbitrary if the Church were at first called Catholic merely in the sense of geographical extension; all becomes rational when you understand that from the first there was more in the appellation, that it denoted some high and religious quality. The sense of extension has never been forgotten; it is probable that to a Greek ear it would always be obvious and prominent, but for Latins it would be obscured, and our own people have to be carefully taught that the Catholic Church of the creed is a world-wide organization. In the same way a Greek Christian would

always be dimly aware that an ἐπίσκοπος was appointed to look after his faith and conduct, but a Latin *episcopus* might be allowed to put aside that duty. In all languages borrowed words have this weakness, as compared with those of native growth; a Frenchman can hardly forget that a *lieutenant* is in some way a substitute, but an Englishman thinks only of the specific functions allotted in practice to a lieutenant. It is therefore not surprising that in Latin the secondary senses of the word *catholicus* become prominent; but I am labouring to show you that such senses are not accidental: they are rooted in the word as originally used by Greeks. A quality is denoted. This quality is intimately connected with geographical extension, but you must be careful to make the connexion in the right way. The Church is not Catholic because it is world-wide; it is world-wide because it is Catholic.

This quality of the Christian Church and of the Christian religion, this Catholicity, is my subject. I am not speaking to you of Catholicism, an ordered system of faith and practice, of doctrine and discipline. I am concerned with the underlying quality of

which Catholicism is but the expression, probably an imperfect expression. What is it?

Before engaging myself with that question I have a remark to interpose. I shall not set before you a cut-and-dried definition by means of which you may determine whether this or that Church, this or that person, this or that doctrine, is rightly to be called Catholic. There is no such thing. The Church is Catholic precisely because it is too large for that sort of particularity. If you attempt this kind of definition you will find you have merely defined a sect. For practical purposes you must approach the question of Catholicity from the other side. This Church is professedly Christian, this man professes and calls himself Christian, therefore this Church or this man is presumably Catholic; for Catholicity is a normal quality of the Christian religion. Being Christian you are Catholic because Christian, unless there be some flaw in your religion serious enough to destroy that quality. The burden of proof rests on the impugner. Or would you examine yourself whether you be in the Catholic Faith? You must ascertain whether there are in your belief or practice defects that are ruinous to Catholicity. You have not to ask whether

you reach a certain standard, but whether you fall short of it. The difference may seem small, but it implies a polar distinction of method. A Christian is presumably Catholic unless he can be shown to be uncatholic; he is not presumably uncatholic until he has made good his claim to be Catholic. Catholicity is not something superadded to Christianity; it is inherent in Christianity unless it be extruded by some contrary quality. What is this inherent Catholicity which the Smyrniote presbyters recognized in themselves?

We must hark back yet nearer to the beginnings of the Church. We can trace the word no further, but we can look for the idea. When St. Peter enters the house of Cornelius at Caesarea it leaps into light. Think how tremendous an event that is in the light of subsequent history. It is only an obscure Jewish teacher visiting an inferior officer of the Roman army. But that obscure teacher is the chief of a small band of men who conceive it to be their mission to regenerate the religion of Israel and to set forward the Messianic kingdom. Before long, even if they have not yet reached that point, they will be claiming the sole true succession;

they are the Israel of God, the Remnant; the rest, though the great majority, have fallen away. They are the inheritors of the promises of the Fathers. A certain continuity, both of principle and of practice, must be maintained in their great work of renovation. But the religion of Israel is eminently a religion of separateness; the holy seed must not mingle with the ruck of humanity. Simon Peter is conscious of this, Galilean though he be. He observes the law of separateness; nothing common nor unclean has entered his mouth. But the heavenly voice bids him go in to the Gentiles, nothing doubting. He goes, and his eyes are opened: "I perceive that God is no respecter of persons, but in every nation he that feareth Him, and worketh righteousness, is acceptable to Him." The door was opened to the Gentiles. It was not yet flung wide. The holy seed would not yet mix with them on equal terms. Peter himself was to hesitate and dissemble. It was the work of St. Paul, through much disputing, through much bitterness, through much unhappiness, to beat down the middle wall of partition, and then to proclaim with almost lyric fervour the united Church in which there was

neither Jew nor Greek, but all were one in Christ.

But to break down the isolation of Judaism was only one step. Much remained to be done. Consider the state of the ancient world, the principle of division ruling everywhere, the jealousy of city against city, of race against race; the contempt of Greek for barbarian, the fundamental distinction of freeman and slave, the arrogance of the *Civis Romanus*. Remember that all these differences had sacred sanctions, that religion was in the main civic or national, that cults were jealously guarded, that gods were opposed to gods. This antagonism was weakening, but it was still vigorous. Then think of the task to which St. Paul knew himself to be called—the task of establishing a religious society in which there should be no distinction of Greek and Jew, circumcision and uncircumcision, barbarian or Scythian, bond or free. Picture to yourself philosophers of Athens, senators of Rome, who were told that they must be reckoned equal to the wild savages beyond the Danube. Try to get some sympathy with Demetrius, who was told that Ephesus was no longer to have its peculiar religion : much

more than his trade was in danger. These men were turning the world upside down. Do you see what Catholicity means? It means the negation of national religion. The Church is Catholic, and therefore a *Landeskirche* is a contradiction in terms. You may talk about a National Church, but you must be careful to know what it means. It must be a Church with a special mission to a nation, not a Church issuing from the thought of a nation, controlled by the genius of a nation, or established by the laws of a nation. There was at Corinth a recrudescence of the old civic religion; St. Paul trampled on it: "What? came the Word of God out from you, or came it to you alone?" The Church is Catholic because in its essence it transcends all national and local particularities. It is the Church of Humanity.

And more. There were already religions that overleaped these barriers, and others no less wide were rising simultaneously with Christianity. The worship of the Genius of Caesar was everywhere in the Roman Empire, with its perfect organization and its appeal alike to the spirit of loyalty and to the prudence of servility. Other religions were larger. In the

far East Buddhism was obliterating caste, and addressing man as man. Roman matrons were running after the mysteries of Isis. The cult of Mithras was open to all seekers who would endure a horrible initiation. If Christianity had competed with these on equal terms, if it had been a religion of humanity only in this sense, it would have had no quarrel with the Roman Empire. But the religion of Christ was essentially exclusive. It was intolerant. It went out expressly to destroy all other religions. It would take no place in a Pantheon. It would not even gather lesser gods into a Pantheon of its own under the sovranty of Christ. It would utterly abolish the idols. It was not exclusive in the Jewish or the Greek sense, for it would shut out no man from its precincts. On the contrary, it would draw all men in, compel them to come in; it would not willingly allow any to lag outside. But the Church was and is exclusive in the sense of claiming to be the sole possessor of the oracles of God, and the only ordered channel of divine grace. It is Catholic, not because it is accidentally spread over the whole world—which in point of fact it is not—but because it is meant by God

to embrace all men in a jealous guardianship.

Again, the Church of Christ transcends not only civic and national boundaries, but the limits even of the visible world. There might conceivably be a religion practised by the whole human race with perfect uniformity, which should nevertheless be the merest local cult. The whole world is not so very much larger than Jerusalem. To an observer in Arcturus the difference would be inappreciable. A word of God coming out from the whole human race would not be much more important than one coming from a coterie of worshippers at Corinth. Indeed the minority might weigh the heavier. The teaching of the Academy at Athens was worth more than all the speculations of all the teeming millions of Asia. The Catholicity of the Church would be a poor thing if it meant only the general agreement of men at a particular moment, or the sum of human thought since the beginning of the world. He would be a bold man who should traverse it, but a prophet or an Athanasius might be bold enough.

Ancient religion was in the main a civic thing; citizenship and worship went together.

But our πολίτευμα, says St. Paul, is in heaven. The idea was not entirely new. It was adumbrated, as the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews saw, in the prophetic books of the Old Testament, and Philo the Alexandrian, almost contemporaneously with St. Paul, was deducing it from them in almost identical terms. The souls of the wise, he said, reckoned the heavenly country to be their fatherland, in which they were citizens, and the earthly abode in which they sojourned was to them a strange land: πατρίδα μὲν τὸν οὐράνιον χῶρον ἐν ᾧ πολιτεύονται, ξένον δὲ τὸν περίγειον ἐν ᾧ παρῴκησαν νομίζουσαι.[1] What the Alexandrian Jew admired in his mythical forefathers, became a commonplace of actual life under the new impulse of the Gospel. You will see that it was not merely a feverish expectation of the παρουσία that made men think of themselves as in a state of suspense, as strangers and pilgrims. The kind of exaltation upon which so much stress has recently been laid would not survive two generations of disappointment. The sentiment of pilgrimage did survive. It is strong in the measured *Epistula ad Diognetum*, which nevertheless labours to show

[1] *De Confusione Linguarum*, 17.

that Christians were good citizens of an earthly commonwealth, and did not differ in mode of life, save by a stricter morality, from their neighbours; *πείθονται τοῖς ὡρισμένοις νόμοις, καὶ τοῖς ἰδίοις βίοις νικῶσι τοὺς νόμους.* The writer piles up words in description of this unworldliness consistent with worldly virtues, and incorporates St. Paul's own phrase in one of his antitheses; Christians pass their time on earth, but their citizenship is in heaven: *ἐπὶ γῆς διατρίβουσιν, ἀλλ' ἐν οὐρανῷ πολιτεύονται.* When he would show how men can be imitators of God he uses the bold phrase *ὅτι Θεὸς ἐν οὐρανοῖς πολιτεύεται.* I need not remind you how in later ages the language of devotion became saturated with this notion that the faithful are here *in via*, journeying *ad patriam*. But that is a modification. Pilgrimage came to mean travel, but I would remind you that originally *peregrinus* was a man residing in a foreign land, not one pressing forward to his true bourne. In the earlier thought of Christianity the Heavenly City was not a future home after which the voyager sighs; it was a present possession, a stronghold in which the faithful had rights; they looked to it as the *civis Romanus* looked to the Forum, wherever

in the world his lot might be cast. Roman citizenship was not a hope some day to settle amid the *opes strepitumque Romae*; these might never be visited, but the *ius civile* was a present mainstay from the Thames to the Euphrates. Recall the nature of citizenship in the ancient world, whether in the form of Greek independence or in the larger Roman conception, and you will get to the real meaning of this heavenly franchise. In the second century, Roman citizenship was the main thing in view, but the sweeping of all subject races into the net of common rights was not yet thought of; that was the work of the coming century; a Roman citizen was still a privileged person; he might be resident at Smyrna or at Tarsus, sharing the municipal life of those towns, but he was somewhat aloof, having a larger right than his neighbour, protected by the majesty of Rome. This great conception must have influenced Christian thought. We know how Caesar seemed to be a rival of God, how Rome was set, as Babylon, over against the Holy City. Into the conception of the Catholicity of the Church there would enter something suggested by the wide influence of the conquering city. But the Empire of God was

wider than that of Caesar ; it was not bounded by the Rhine or the Euphrates ; it passed the limits of the inhabited earth ; its Forum, its Capitol, was on the heavenly hills ; its eternity was no poetic dream ; its universality was not an idle boast, was not geographic, but cosmic.

It seems to me not altogether insignificant that in the document where for the first time we find a local Church called Catholic that Church is described as *παροικοῦσα ἐν Σμύρνῃ*. This word, you will remember, was used by Philo to express the sense of being strangers and pilgrims on earth, which he ascribed to the patriarchs. He found the word in the Septuagint, where the pilgrim of the Gradual Psalms, looking to Jerusalem, the city of solemnities, sighs, "Woe is me that I am constrained to dwell with Mesech!"[1] It may represent plain fact ; a *πάροικος* was a foreigner, in the proper sense of that much-abused term, a man dwelling in a land or a city not his own, exiled from his own people. But in the language of devotion it receives even here the metaphorical or spiritual sense adopted by Philo. In that sense it

[1] Ps. cxix. 5, *οἴμοι ὅτι ἡ παροικία μου ἐμακρύνθη.*

passed into Christian use.[1] You may think it an affectation, a touch of preciosity, when the Smyrniote presbyters employ it in the formal inscription of a letter. St. Paul had in plain language addressed τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ τῇ οὔσῃ ἐν Κορίνθῳ, and St. Ignatius was content with the same form, but for a striking variation in the case of the Roman Church.[2] This use of the word παροικοῦσα is found, however, in the Epistle of St. Clement to the Church of Corinth, as also in St. Polycarp's own Epistle to the Philippians. His presbyters followed his example; with them it was not improbably a familiar commonplace. And their exile Church they called Catholic. It was in Smyrna, but it was not properly Smyrniote; it transcended the local habitation by virtue of the quality which made it but a stranger there, having its citizenship in heaven. And that is true of the whole Church throughout the world. Here, then, is another element in Catholicity. The Catholic Church is a pilgrim Church.

[1] Heb. xi. 9, παρῴκησεν. 1 St. Pet. i. 17, παροικίας; ii. 11, παροίκους.

[2] Ἥτις καὶ προκάθηται ἐν τόπῳ χωρίου Ῥωμαίων, with much complimentary amplification.

I find a fourth element. Ancient religion was not only a religion of local cults, but it was the worship of local gods. The gods were essentially gods of the family, of the tribe, of the city or nation. There were attempts to escape from this limitation. Sun-worship is an example. The Persian religion seems to have achieved a complete emancipation, at the cost of dualism. But escape was usually in the direction of confusion, and the worship of other gods in addition to your own. Polytheism, whatever else it may be, is syncretic. Greek philosophers, like those of India, could rise to the conception of universal theism, but their theology could hardly be translated into the terms of the ancient religion. Alone, or almost alone, the prophets of Israel found their way to a true monotheism. The way was not found easily or speedily. You see it triumphantly passed over when the fortunes of the nation are at the lowest ebb. The prophets, breaking away from the traditional belief that defeat and conquest imply the defeat of the tribal god by the gods of strangers, aver that Yahweh, the God of Israel, is not merely greater, in spite of all appearances, than the gods of the victorious

nations, but that He is the one Lord of heaven and earth, and the rest are naught, dumb idols.[1] This became the peculiar conviction of the Jews, unshaken by any catastrophe. Christianity entered upon their heritage, enriching it after some hesitation with the complementary truth that the chosen people of God is no less universal than the sovranty of God. The Church is Catholic because God is One. In the idea of Catholicity there is a protest, not only against the civic religion that must have a peculiar cult, the national religion that demands a national God, but also against any theoretic limitation of God. He is παντοκράτωρ, *omnipotens*; nothing is withdrawn from His sway. He is not, indeed, the impersonal Absolute of idealist philosophy, or the All of pantheism; but He is infinite, as Aubrey Moore said, in the adjectival sense: He is *immensus*. This complete monotheism is involved in the idea of Catholicity.

In Catholicity are these four elements. We shall find other elements, less obviously present, which call for particular examination. These

[1] See especially Jeremiah x, and cf. xiv. 22; xxvii. 5–9. I find this theme well developed in *Jérémie, sa Politique, sa Théologie*, by the Abbé Charles Jean.

four are primary; they constitute the idea. Catholicity means that the Christian religion embraces ideally and potentially all mankind; it means that no rival or supplementary cult is to be endured; it means the transcendence, not only of civic or national bounds, but of the whole world; it means the proclamation of One transcendent God. And this fourfold quality is found, vitally energetic, in the smallest fraction of the whole Christian society. The local Church is not merely a part of the universal Church; it does not merely represent the whole; it is a true microcosm. All that is in the whole Church is there. As Harnack has well said, the whole is in the part, and not merely the part in the whole.[1] Catholicity is fundamentally this in its primary significance; from this all secondary meanings must flow, and to this they must conform.

[1] *The Constitution and Law of the Church in the First Two Centuries* (Engl. tr.), p. 46.

II

THE ORGANIC ELEMENT

THE Church, being universal, is one; there is no room for another. Unity and Catholicity go inseparably together. And, being one, the Church should also be united. These two notions are distinct, but it is not always easy to keep the distinction clear in language. For union is a property of oneness, and we constantly have to use words etymologically connected to express the two ideas; *unica* and *unita* are obviously near akin, and are closely allied in meaning as epithets of *ecclesia*. The distinction is more easily marked in English, but here also it has to be guarded, and we use the word *unity* in both senses. In the former sense it stands for a natural fact that cannot be altered; there is but one Church, and there can be none other. In the other sense it stands for a moral obligation, a purpose of God that can be thwarted. Our Lord prayed,

"That they all may be one;" and that prayer would be unmeaning if the unity so desired were a natural necessity. In this sense unity, though it goes with uniqueness, implies also multiplicity; those whose unity is an object of desire must be many. The Church is therefore both one and many; it is one body comprising many members. That is an important part of the meaning of Catholicity.

This kind of unity can be achieved in various ways, of which two may engage our attention. A number of individuals may be united into a single aggregate. A number of men may be united into a single society; a number of independent communities may be united into a single federal State. You may call this an artificial union. It is not merely artificial, for it springs from the ordinary working of human nature; but it is artificial in so far as it is realized by the more or less conscious energy of human wills. It remains artificial, even if the component parts, once united, lose the power or the right of separating. On the other hand, a single and homogeneous entity may by differentiation be divided into parts without loss of unity. That is the physiological origin

of an articulated animal body ; it is not built up of gathered members, but begins as a single cell, out of which the members are produced by differentiation of parts. You find various degrees of such differentiation in various examples of the animal kingdom ; mammals are more completely articulated than birds and reptiles, and there is a descending scale down to the amoeba ; but every individual animal begins life as a nucleated cell compared with which the amoeba is a complicated organism. In the same way, though by the working of less rigorous laws, a civic community, small and homogeneous, may in the course of ages grow into an elaborate political organism, minutely subdivided ; and even a fully developed State may consciously divide itself without loss of unity in either sense of the word ; many degrees of Home Rule are possible. Unity which thus begins with simplicity and develops multiplicity may be called a natural or organic unity.

The unity of the Church is a combination of these two modes, but it is chiefly an organic unity. That is indicated when it is called the Body of Christ. Historically the Church

was a continuation of the Jewish polity; it was the faithful Remnant, from which the mass of the people fell away. But the organization of this Remnant begins from the person of the Incarnate Son of God. According to the flesh He is the Seed of Abraham; and, as St. Paul saw clearly, even while expressing the fact by a strange exegesis of Rabbinical subtlety, He alone is the Seed according to promise. In Him are concentrated both the privileges of Abraham and the spiritual rights of Adam, including those which had fallen into abeyance through sin. He, the Lord from heaven, is also the New Man, renewed in the image of God. He is, so to say, the nucleus from which a renovated human society is to spring. "In Him was Life, and the Life was the light of men." From this beginning grows the articulated Body of Christ. The unity of the Church is organic.

But, on the other hand, individual men are gathered, aggregated, incorporated, into this unity. The faithful are "added to the Church." The Church is not formed by this aggregation. It exists before a single member is incorporated. It is not a mere society, still less a federal union of societies.

But there is aggregation, there is incorporation. Consequently, the imagery of the Body and its members, of the Vine and its branches, will not express the whole truth. St. Paul found another image in the branch grafted into a tree-stock. It is curious to observe that his argument required him to reverse the usual method and to speak of a scion of wild olive being engrafted into a fruit-olive—an inversion to which his description of the process as *παρὰ φύσιν* may possibly refer—but this does not affect the substance of the illustration; he is thinking only of the engrafted branch which lives by the sap of the tree communicated to it.[1] You may press the illustration further. The hospitable tree, rejoicing in *non sua poma*, may remind you of the glory and honour of the nations which are to be brought into the City of God. The individuals aggregated to the Church contribute something to the Church.

The Church is united, then, because it is one; but the oneness does not, if I may so say, automatically effect union. The unity of the Church is not merely natural or organic.

[1] Rom. xi. 17–24.

It is chiefly this, but partly also an effect of aggregation. It is chiefly the work of God, but partly also the work of men, as fellow-workers with God. In other words, it is partly natural, partly artificial. It is a thing to be declared; it is also a thing to be worked for and desired in prayer.

The Catholicity of the Church is intimately connected with its uniqueness. It is Catholic, in the sense of universal, because it is one, and one alone. The oneness of the Church is also intimately connected with its unity; it is united because it is one. These three qualities hang together — unity, uniqueness, and Catholicity. You may say, then, that Catholicity is a quality in the Church that makes for unity. And you may go further. The individual member contributes to the unity of the Church; he can mar it, and he helps to make it. He can partake of the qualities in the Church which make for unity. And Catholicity is such a quality. Therefore Catholicity is a quality in the individual; a man may be called Catholic.

In another sense of the word, to which we shall come later, this is more obvious. But I am trying here to show that in its

primary and fundamental sense Catholicity can be attributed to the individual. So regarded, it becomes a temper, an ἦθος, characteristic of his religion. You may recognize degrees in it. A good Catholic will be one who works and prays for that perfect unity of the Church that accords with the will of God, who labours to correct all in himself that may cause disunion, who strives to weld others into that unity. A bad Catholic will be one who approves these things in theory, but neglects them in practice.

I have come down to a modern form of speech, but now I must go back. You have considered with me how a particular local Church could be called Catholic. Add to what we then found this further consideration. A local Church, equally with an individual Christian, may be called a member of the Body of Christ. At times, indeed, this has been the more common use of the term; at times, that is to say, when the corporate activity of the Church has been more in view than the individual Christian life. In the fourteenth century, when men were loudly demanding the reformation of the Church *in capite et in membris*, they were not thinking

of the individual morality either of the Pope or of a ploughman; they wanted to reform the papal court and the corrupt administration of dioceses. A local particular Church, like an individual Christian, is a member of the universal Church, and, like the individual Christian, it may have or lack this temper that makes for unity, the temper of Catholicity.

And now I ask another question—not how the Church of Smyrna could be called Catholic, but why it was so called. The presbyters announcing the martyrdom of Polycarp were careful to describe him as Bishop of the *Catholic* Church in Smyrna. Why this precision?

It would not seem natural to introduce such a descriptive term without special reason. For it was descriptive; it was not yet become a mere appellative. How far the word had passed into common use we cannot ascertain, but so much may be affirmed pretty confidently. Not only did the word mean something definite, but it was used for some definite purpose. St. Ignatius spoke of the Catholic Church in distinction from the local particular Church. So also did the Smyrniote presbyters. But from what did they distinguish

the local Church at Smyrna when they called this also Catholic ?

There seems to be only one possible answer. There was a Church of some kind at Smyrna that was not Catholic. What was this ? The use of the word that became general in the next century will enlighten us. The Catholic Church of a city was then distinguished from groups of men who, though Christian, stood aloof from the main body. I purposely put it, for the present, in the most general way possible. Such groups there seem to have been almost everywhere. The beginnings of this state of things at Corinth alarmed and angered St. Paul. There is good ground for supposing that the institution of episcopacy—the establishment, that is to say, of a chief pastor in every city—was designed expressly to combat the tendency to such grouping. Otherwise the oversight of many local Churches in a wide region by a travelling Apostle might have continued, and have been preferred. It is interesting to observe that the arrangements of the far-reaching Diocese of York are more apostolic than those of the primitive episcopacy which has been revived in your favour at Birmingham.

But, whether this be the original purpose of the episcopal system or not, it was certainly the use to which the system was put. It is the constant theme of the Ignatian epistles that the bishop is the centre of unity. Nothing must be done without him. Baptism and the Eucharist, especially, are functions in which he must preside. There is a correlative: he must do nothing without the Church, its presbyters, and deacons; he also must avoid an excessive individuality. But Ignatius says more. All who belong to God and to Jesus Christ, he says, are with the bishop: ὅσοι Θεοῦ εἰσι καὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, οὗτοι μετὰ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου εἰσίν.[1] That is seriously said. It is put forward as a statement of fact, and it is difficult to avoid the converse conclusion; those who are not with the bishop do not belong to Christ. They are not members of the Body. They are not properly Christians. You may recall sentences from the Gospel which look the same way. He who will not hear the Church, speaking presumably by the bishop, is relegated to the standing of the heathen. The branch that does not abide in the vine is withered. Does

[1] Philad. iii. 2.

a man abide in the Vine, which is Christ, when he cuts himself adrift from the bishop who is Christ's representative?

There is much in the letters of Ignatius implying a negative answer. You will find the same implication in the writings and the acts of St. Cyprian; analogous judgements have been pronounced from time to time down to our own day. I have heard a most respected theologian say that he was not sure whether he could admit the right of English Dissenters to be called Christians. But the dominant judgement of the Church has gone the other way. You will find it in the decision of the controversy about the baptism of heretics against the sense of St. Cyprian. You will find it in the terms on which certain schismatics were received at Nicaea. You will find it in the law of the Conclave, which allows an excommunicate cardinal to vote at the election of a Pope. There are degrees of separation, nor is it quite clear what is the effect even of complete apostasy. One who goes out, or is cast out, from the ordered unity of the Church does not altogether cease to be a member of the Church. A fanciful distinction has been drawn between belonging to

the body and belonging to the soul of the Church. It suits some of the cases in view, but not all, and it is unnecessary; the analogy of the body is no more complete than any other analogy, and it fails in respect of amputation. A later theology will try to solve the difficulty by leaning hard on the indelible character of Baptism. It would be anachronistic to throw back that solution to the second century, but the truth which it enshrines was seized in another form, and schismatics were recognized as being in some way members of the Church. The severity of St. Ignatius was not general; perhaps it was not, even in his own case, more than earnest pleading for unity.

But if these separated and scattered members are still to be reckoned in some sort members of the universal Church, is a gathering of them to be called in the local and particular sense a Church? There is another saying of Ignatius. We do not speak of a Church, he says, where there is no bishop and presbytery: χωρὶς τούτων ἐκκλησία οὐ καλεῖται.[1] Would he, then, allow that venerable title to be used of casual groups of Christians segregated from

[1] Trall. iii. 1.

the bishop? And if not, why should it be necessary to distinguish the congregation adhering to Polycarp as the Catholic Church in Smyrna? Why not call it simply the Church? Here, you see, is a question which is presented to us afresh in our own day. Are those congregations of Dissenters, with which we are familiar, to be called Churches? I think we must reply that they certainly are Churches. They are groups of baptized persons; and groups of baptized men and women, organized for the purposes of Christian worship and of the Christian life, are Churches. What else was the Church in the house of Philemon or of Aquila, to which St. Paul sent greeting? It is evident that we must read this sentence of Ignatius with some latitude. If you press it rigorously you will be landed in the absurd conclusion that *sede vacante* your Church of Birmingham ceased to exist. It may move you less to reflect that the existence of the famous Church of Westminster depends on the accident of its having a retired bishop for dean. We must suppose that St. Ignatius was here doing nothing more than state with the utmost possible emphasis the proper order and constitution of a local Church. That

groups improperly organized were known as Churches at Smyrna seems to me almost incontestable, the group over which Polycarp presided being called Catholic because of its adherence to the true type. The dissenting congregations that we have about us come into the same category. The question is not whether they are Churches, but whether they are Catholic Churches. I can see no good reason for refusing to call them Churches. Duchesne has not been censured for writing of *églises séparées*, and you hardly need be afraid of erring in his company.

We may therefore conclude that the Church at Smyrna presided over by Polycarp is called Catholic precisely because it is under his presidency; it consists of those who adhere to the ordered unity of which he, as bishop, is the organic centre. The description is required because there are in Smyrna other Churches not adhering to him. In my last lecture I raised the question whether it could be called Catholic as embracing all Christians gathered into several congregations within the city; we now see that it is so called, on the contrary, precisely as excluding such

congregations if they are not in communion with the bishop.

But here is a verbal inconsistency: the word *catholic*, from being a term of universality, is become a term of limitation. That is true, and the inconsistency continues all through history. You may find some glaring instances. In one of Constantine's letters about the Donatists, which we have in the Greek rendering of Eusebius, he speaks of ἡ αἵρεσις ἡ καθολική.[1] His own word was probably *secta*; he spoke of the Catholic sect. The phrase exactly resembles that by which some of us offend others in speaking of the "Catholic Party." Perhaps it would be wiser not to follow so closely in the footsteps of the half-converted emperor. But this use of the word *Catholic* cannot be avoided; you cannot go behind the practice of nearly eighteen centuries. It soon extended from the local Church to the Church at large. As the Catholic Church at Smyrna consisted of those who adhered to the bishop as centre of unity, so the Catholic Church at large consisted of those, and was limited to those, who adhered to a larger

[1] Euseb. *H. E.* x. 5. Imperial letter to Chrestus of Syracuse.

order of unity. It was what Duchesne, steeped in memories of the *petite église* of France, loves to call the Great Church.

That curious outcome of the French Revolution, the *petite église*, so aptly illustrates my theme that I must ask leave to detain you a moment for its consideration. The Pope, you will remember, denounced the Civil Constitution of the clergy, set up in 1790, and almost all the French bishops, with the majority of the clergy, refused to accept it. In 1801 Pius VII made peace with the Republic; by the Concordat of that year the Civil Constitution was withdrawn, but most of its less objectionable features were established afresh by papal authority; the new arrangement of dioceses was confirmed, and most of the old bishops, already in actual exile, were removed *de iure* from their sees. They protested, denied the right of the Pope so to depose them, and engaged a small number of priests and of the faithful in their resistance. No attempt was made to carry on an episcopal succession, but the priesthood was for a time sparsely recruited from the disaffected in the Church of the Concordat. At the present day, I believe, a small remnant of

the laity lingers on, without ministers and without sacraments, in a sullen and senseless schism. These men are strictly orthodox; even Gallicanism hardly enters into their thought; they do not question the supreme authority of the Pope, but only a particular act of the papal administration. Such is the *petite église*, and such was most of the heresy and schism of the second century. I do not speak of Gnosticism, for that was hardly Christian, but of the petty groups which in various places separated themselves or were cut off from the communion of the Great Church. I shall have to speak on another occasion of the doctrinal aberration that accompanied or followed this kind of schism, but heresy did not yet signify as much. At the end of the century, Tertullian was fastening upon the word that significance just when he himself was falling into heresy; by inaccurate exegesis he tried to distinguish between the σχίσματα and the αἱρέσεις which St. Paul coupled together.[1] But that was a development yet to follow; at the time of which I am speaking the heretic was still, as in the Epistle to Titus, a stiffly opinionated man who could not get

[1] 1 Cor. xi. 18, 19. Tertull., *De Praescr.* 5.

on with his fellows ; the contrasted temper was naturally Catholic. Even for St. Cyprian heresy is chiefly a principle of division ; it occurs "dum peruersa mens non habet pacem, dum perfidia discordans non tenet unitatem ;" it is even useful, under the providence of God, for dividing the chaff from the wheat ; it is seen in those "qui nemine episcopatum dante episcopi sibi nomen adsumunt."[1] You are still far from the state of things in which doctrinal error becomes the great cause of disunion, and heresy is identified with heterodoxy.[2]

We ought now to be able to see clearly what is Catholicity in relation to the unity of the Church. By an irony of circumstance it is only because the Church is divided that the word has obtained its vogue. They are distinctively Catholic who adhere to the ordered method of promoting unity. Catholicity is a quality, alike in the Church at large, in the local Church, and in the individual Christian, which makes for unity. It is a temper, and a practical temper. It is not

[1] *De Unitate* 10.

[2] St. Ignatius speaks of heterodoxy in another connexion. *Smyrn.* vi. 2.

a vague aspiration after unity, but a temper which seizes and holds the way to unity. In the second century, the only visible way to unity was adherence to the communion of the bishop of each several Church, regarded as the Vicar of Christ. Catholicity could therefore be summed up as loyal adherence of the Church at large to the Lord Jesus Christ, the supreme Pastor, and loyal adherence of the local particular Church to its own bishop. But this was Catholicity only because the bishop was the accepted centre and symbol of unity. If this kind of episcopacy proved a failure, if it were found that the bishop himself might be a cause of disunion, if some other ordering should therefore become necessary, then the rejection of this new ordering, and an obstinate adherence to the bishop, would become uncatholic. Catholicity is the temper which seizes and holds the ordered way of unity, whatever that way may be.

Here I make a digression, if only to show that I have not forgotten a grave question. If it be true that communion with the Roman See is by divine appointment the ordered way of unity, or even if it has been so ordered by

the wisdom of the Church, then Catholicity involves adherence to that communion. You ought not to meet with impatient resentment those who judge this to be the case, and therefore call themselves exclusively Catholics. You who judge otherwise cannot allow them an exclusive right to the title, and it may often be your duty to make that plain in speech; but you should not treat the assumption of it as an impertinence. They are really showing the temper of Catholicity by insisting on what they take to be the only effective mode of union for Christendom. The only proper contention against them is a demonstration, either *a priori* or *a posteriori*, that communion with the Roman See is not the ordered way of unity. If my subject were Catholicism, the working system which is an expression, more or less imperfect, of Catholicity, I should have to deal with this question at large. As it is, I have but to glance at it—now, and perhaps again.

To return: Catholicity meant in the second century a temper of loyal adherence to the Great Church. For the local Church, and for its individual members, the link was the bishop. But bishops themselves were

individuals; their thoughts, their practices, their teaching, might be divergent. Each was the centre of unity for his own Church, but he might become a focus of disorder and disunion for the Church at large. An heretical bishop would be more mischievous than a single individual heretic, a faction of bishops worse than a faction within the Church of Smyrna or of Philadelphia. St. Paul had a rough rule to apply in such cases; local Churches must conform, more or less, to each other's usages. When petulance and Hellenic restlessness suggested singularities at Corinth, he put down his foot: "We have no such custom, neither the Churches of God." But St. Paul was an Apostle, speaking with great weight of authority: who could speak so peremptorily a hundred years later? Here was one of the difficulties produced by the substitution of local episcopacy for general apostolic oversight.

It does not appear that the difficulty was tackled on its theoretic side before the time of St. Cyprian. There is evidence that the greater Churches, and notably those of Rome and Alexandria, intervened from time to time for the purpose of allaying disorders by the

weight of their authority. The Epistle of St. Clement to the Corinthians is an instance, prior, perhaps, to the establishment of monarchic episcopacy at Corinth. Most familiar is the reference of St. Irenaeus to the unifying influence of the Church of Rome with its *potior principalitas*. Tertullian, while still a Catholic, advised reference to one or other of the Churches actually founded by Apostles, as at Corinth, Philippi, Ephesus, and, the most conspicuous of all, at Rome.[1] We might expect to find a theory worked out, assigning a special authority to these apostolic sees, and so anticipating the patriarchal system of the fifth century, or even the later papacy. But it does not appear; and St. Cyprian, when he addressed himself expressly to the task of expounding the way of unity, took another direction. He too extols the Church of Rome, "Ecclesia principalis unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est," and that in a letter dealing with just such a case of intervention as I have mentioned; but at the same time he scornfully repels the suggestion that bishops in Africa had any less authority,[2] and in his formal treatise on the Unity of the Catholic Church he assigns

[1] *De Praescr.* 36. [2] Ep. 59. 14.

no prerogatives to the apostolic sees or to the greater Churches. He puts all bishops on a footing of absolute equality. All alike are successors of the Apostles, and receive their mission through the Apostles from Christ. How, then, are these many kept in union? They have not each a separate mission; the episcopate is a single order, a common possession, which is not partitioned among them, but is held *in solidum* by each one. The terms are legal, for Cyprian was a jurist, but the sense is not obscure. This unity is further illustrated by the original mission. It was given first to St. Peter alone, for a manifestation of its oneness; afterwards the other Apostles also received it, becoming the equals of St. Peter in dignity and power: "Hoc erant utique et ceteri apostoli quod fuit Petrus, pari consortio praediti et honoris et potestatis." You see that St. Cyprian leaves no room for St. Peter even as *princeps apostolorum*, except in the sense of being the first commissioned. From this equal and united apostolate the equal and united episcopate descends. Every bishop is the successor of St. Peter; his throne is the *Cathedra Petri*. So St. Cyprian could say, in speaking of the internal affairs of his

own Church of Carthage, "Deus unus est, et Christus unus, et una ecclesia, et cathedra una super Petrum Domini uoce fundata." [1]

The catholicity of a bishop is therefore determined by his adhesion to the whole body of the episcopate. From this conception there issues a working catholicism. A bishop's proper place is settled by the consentient voice of other bishops; they plant him, and they can remove him. If he separate himself from the rest, or if they cut him off, he is no true bishop. For practical purposes the bishops must act in groups, and so the provincial system, and ultimately the patriarchal, will follow from the Cyprianic principle of equality. In the case of the patriarchates, however, this will be complicated by the older conception of the dignity of apostolic sees. In the last resort, the episcopate of the whole world must in some way be consulted. That should end all disputes.

So St. Augustine answered all the evasions of the Donatists. They were the most exasperating of disputants, and their faults affected their opponents; St. Augustine himself never appears to so little advantage as when engaged

[1] Ep. 43. 5. See Appendix A, *Cathedra Petri*.

with them. The task was the more difficult since at the beginning they had a good case. They objected, not without grave reasons, to the election of Caecilian as Bishop of Carthage, and put forward a rival claimant. But all the bishops of the world, outside the African provinces, recognized Caecilian. What more was to be said? Obstinately continuing their opposition, the Donatists put themselves in the wrong, and showed themselves uncatholic. They went to absurd lengths, asserting that all who favoured Caecilian were partakers of his fault, and so they alone, the Donatists of Africa, remained faithful, and formed the entire Catholic Church. This was to give themselves away utterly, and St. Augustine told them with unwearied iteration that by separating themselves from the episcopate of the whole world they were ensuring their own condemnation. The whole world could, without hesitation, condemn those who in a particular section of the world separated themselves from the world: "Securus iudicat orbis terrarum, bonos non esse qui se dividunt ab orbe terrarum, in quacunque parte orbis terrarum."[1]

[1] *Contra Ep. Parmeniani*, iii. 4. See Appendix B.

That was conclusive, because there was practical unanimity of the rest of the episcopate against the Donatists, and they themselves proclaimed it. But I would have you observe that such unanimity could not always be secured. You must not suppose that the Cyprianic principle, because it could logically settle the Donatist difficulty, could therefore solve all similar problems. St. Augustine could not apply his *securus iudicat* to the long schism of Meletians and Eustathians at Antioch, because there was no unanimous judgement of the *orbis terrarum*. The episcopate of the world was divided on the question, which therefore had to be settled by accommodation. Still less could this measure be applied when Leo IX of Rome, in the year 1054, broke off communion with Michael Cerularius of Constantinople, and the whole West and the whole East drew apart in that schism which the pleadings of eight centuries have not yet healed.

What shall we say to this? The history of the Church is in great part the record of attempts to find an absolute Catholicism, a system perfectly expressing Catholicity. The quest is vain, because the Catholic Church

transcends the limits of the world to which our search is confined. There can only be a working system, and that will fail at certain breaking points. The system of the papal monarchy, whether founded in truth or in falsehood, whether of divine or of human appointment, can no more escape this law than any other system. The election of an antipope is the breaking point, for the system provides no means of deciding between the two claimants. The dispute must be settled either by accommodation or by lapse of time.

Where, then, is Catholicity? I have described it as the temper, in Churches and in men, which seizes and holds the way of unity, whatever this may be. But what if the acknowledged way of unity be forked? Let me illustrate the position by what happened on a memorable occasion.

When the papacy was at its apogee, when its authority was unquestioned in the whole Western Church, then it failed most conspicuously. Christendom was distracted by the rival claims of two, and finally of three Popes. What happened? The Council of Constance cut the knot by compelling all three claimants to stand aside, and directing the

election of a new Pope. That proceeding was revolutionary. According to the current theory of the Church, unquestioned by any in the Council, the Pope could be judged of none. It was a disputed question whether a General Council were superior to him in matters of faith, but in point of discipline or jurisdiction he was undisputed chief. Lip-service was done to this theory, but it was violated. The Council set aside three claimants, one of whom must have been true Pope, and ordered a new election by a process that was only colourably canonical. The act, I say, was revolutionary. Gerson laboured in vain to justify it on the accepted principles of Catholicism.

But the Council was Catholic. What was its catholicity? Its catholicity consisted precisely in this, that it transcended the accepted Catholicism of the day. The catholicity of Gerson is found, not in his laboured argument *de auferibilitate Papae*, but in the underlying assumption that the government of the Church must be carried on, and in the bold practical step which he advised the Council to take with that end in view. The leaders of the Council were Catholic because they realized that the

Catholic Church is larger than any system devised to express Catholicity.

This gives me my final conclusion. Catholicity is the temper that seizes and holds the ordinary way of unity, without contempt, without neglect, without evasion, but which can also, in case of need, throw itself upon the guidance of the Divine Spirit, and strike out for new and untrodden ways.

You will see how this organic test of Catholicity must be applied. I cannot sufficiently insist on the truth that Catholicity is not an added grace, but an inherent quality of the Christian religion. A Christian does not become Catholic; he was not baptized into anything smaller than the organic unity of the Catholic Church. But he may cease to be Catholic; he may develop flaws in his religion that will deprive him of that character; he may fall into schism. But he began well. "Go into your infant-school," I once heard Fr. Benson say, "as into a community of saints." Baptized, you were baptized into the Catholic Church, and in the Catholic Church you remain unless you are cut off. You are not Catholic because you adhere to a particularly organized community; you belong to a

particularly organized community because you are a Catholic Christian. You are Catholic unless you are schismatic. What is true of you is true of others. You must acknowledge a Christian to be Catholic unless you can prove him to be schismatic.

III

THE DOGMATIC ELEMENT

THE standard of communion with the Great Church, which we have been considering, may be called a social test of Catholicity. If the Church were a mere society, this might be sufficient. An aggregation of individuals may be effectively held together by the loyal adhesion of individuals to the aggregate. Yet even there the association will usually have a basis in some common purpose, and disregard of that purpose will hardly be consistent with membership. I have called your attention to the intimate connexion between the catholicity of the Church and a true, transcendent monotheism; men, or groups of men, could not retain the quality of Catholicity if they departed from that monotheism in the direction either of polytheism or of immanental pantheism. But there is much more than this to be said about the Christian Church. The Church springs from

the Incarnate Word, as an articulated body from a nucleated cell. And the essence of the Incarnation is the fact that the one transcendent, incomprehensible God is revealed to men in Jesus Christ. The revelation is incomplete. There are vast immeasurable reticences. God is revealed only as working for our salvation. And He is revealed in a mystery, by symbols and symbolic actions, the full meaning of which is slowly and with difficulty apprehended. What we see, we see dimly as in a mirror. Yet, even so, it is of paramount importance. The function of the Church is to keep this revealed truth.

The revelation of Jesus Christ, as designed for this present world and for our present life, is so far complete that we have no right to expect any addition. It is sufficient for its purpose. But complete apprehension of it is another matter; the purpose must be achieved by labour. The way of salvation is revealed as an entering into eternal life by the knowledge of God, and that knowledge is seldom or never attained by a flash of intuition. The great mystics go far by such means, especially when to their mysticism is added sanctity, but their knowledge is

individual, terminating with themselves; what St. Paul saw and heard in ecstasy could not be told to others in words which they might understand. Salvation is not for mystics alone, as the Neo-Platonists thought; it is for the common run of men. The knowledge of God, which is their eternal life, must therefore be communicated to them slowly, with much patience, with infinite pains and striving. How shall this be done?

The Christian revelation is in Jesus Christ Himself. It is not contained in a scheme of words, clear-cut and precise. It is not a code of morals or a metaphysic. It is in Jesus Christ Himself, in His life among men, in His words and actions, in His tenderness and in His anger, in His human relations and in His loneliness, in His death, and in His resurrection. These were enshrined in the memories of those with whom He had lived; they are described for us in the fragmentary records which we call the Holy Gospels. But the revelation is not, as the Ritschlians think, a merely historic record, by means of which, learning something of the mind of God, we may individually enter into communion with the Divine Nature. It is

clear that our Lord, when departing out of this world to the Father, left behind Him a society, which was more than a mere band of disciples; it had more than a memory of Him, for it had a corporate life drawn from His own. In His followers, both individually and collectively, He had planted certain fruitful ideas, with a power of development. To what extent He had instructed them in the details of what they were to do—the things pertaining to the kingdom of God—cannot be ascertained; perhaps very little. But they had an immense equipment. You do not diminish the importance of their memories by insisting on their spiritual endowments. The memories were the matter on which the Spirit was to work: He was to bring to their remembrance all that they had seen and heard in their intercourse with Jesus. I shall not detain you with the special revelation given to St. Paul, for it was not something additional; he himself, even when asserting its separateness, identified it with that which the Twelve had received, and did not disdain conference with them; for all the independence of his call, he was admitted, you will remember, by baptism into their fellowship.

I think it is not too much to suggest that he wisely verified his subjective revelation by comparing it with their more objective memories. They added nothing, he says, *οὐδὲν προσανέθεντο*, but on the contrary, acknowledged that his gospel was theirs.[1]

The Apostles, then, had a Gospel, a message of good, which they were to communicate to mankind as a revelation of God; and it was to be communicated, not merely as a verbal pronouncement, *κήρυγμα*, but much more by the influence of a life lived in community. In wonderfully picturesque language that Epistle to the Ephesians, which is like a triumphal song on the unification of the Church, attributes to this completed unity the development of the knowledge of God in the individual man. There is one Body and one Spirit, one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one God and Father of all; the gift of grace is several to each man, producing various effects; but where it seems most individual, dividing to diverse men diverse functions, it is still directed to the end of unity; if it is for the perfecting of the saints, it is also for the building up of the Body of Christ—"till

[1] Gal. ii. 6.

we all attain unto the unity of the Faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a complete man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ." Here are two things, an original gift and a growing appropriation of it. The gift is to individuals as members of a community, and the growth is by the interaction of the one and the many.

There is one Faith as well as one Body. There is a Catholic Faith as well as a Catholic Church. The Church is one through the ages, as it is one throughout the world. But to be Catholic it must, as we have seen, transcend the world; its πολίτευμα is in heaven. So also to be Catholic it must transcend the ages; if we know it in time we must conceive it also *in specie aeternitatis*. So with the Catholic Faith: to be Catholic it must be one through the ages and beyond. But faith is the appropriation of the revealed truth of God; the Catholic Faith is the corporate appropriation of it by the Catholic Church; if there is a growing appropriation, how can this consist with the unity and catholicity of the Faith?

There are two aspects in which revelation may be regarded. It may be regarded as a deposit committed to the keeping of the

Church. It may be regarded as a development, a progressive unfolding of the truth of God. The two are distinct; they are inconsistent with each other; and yet they are not opposed, for they are complementary. If either be insisted on, to the exclusion of the other, or if either be interpreted so as to nullify the other, you have the falsehood of partial truth.

If the *depositum fidei* be conceived as a body of formal doctrine, there can be no growth, no true development, except by way of addition; and this will destroy the unity of the Faith. Additions to Christian doctrine may be true and may be universally accepted, but they cannot be Catholic; nothing is Catholic but what is actually contained in the original deposit.

An attempt has been made to escape from this difficulty by the supposition of a progressive explication of what was implicit in the deposit. I shall try presently to show how true that supposition is in a certain sense; but if it be applied to a deposit consisting of a formal body of doctrine there is still a negation of growth. The supposition has taken two forms. One of them is hardly worth considering. The Apostles are sup-

posed to have received from our Lord a detailed knowledge of all Christian doctrine, which was retained by the Church—apparently in a sort of corporate subconsciousness—and doled out to the faithful οἰκονομικῶς, by careful stewards of the divine mysteries, as need arose and as the Holy Spirit directed. In the other form the supposition is more tolerable. It is supposed that in the original deposit all Christian doctrine was really contained, but not set out in express terms. The deposit is in this case the actual teaching of the Apostles, which is partly enshrined in the canonical writings of the New Testament, partly stored up in the corporate memory or unwritten tradition of the Church. The meaning and full content of this teaching was in some measure obscure, but can be drawn out by reflection with the help of Christian experience. The explication is properly theological; hence the *consensus theologorum* is of capital importance; what the common sense of theologians draws out of the deposit is not an addition to the Faith, but is to be accepted as an integral part of the Catholic Faith, one for all time. These theological developments are not inferences, probable or necessary, from the

contents of the deposit, for in that case they would be additions; they are parts of the deposit which had been unnoticed for lack of attention, but which the piety of the faithful or the gainsaying of heretics has brought into prominence. The Apostles, for example, did really teach the Immaculate Conception of our Lady, but in such obscure terms that the fact was not observed for some centuries, and was not finally established by the consentient witness of theologians until sixty years ago.

This is New Scholasticism: not a great improvement on the old. Strip it of the unwritten tradition of the Church, confine the deposit to what is contained in the canonical Scriptures, pack into it the practice and discipline as well as the faith of the Church, and you have Calvinism.

Here is no growth, but a form of doctrine fixed from the first. On the other hand, you may have a conception of development which ignores the deposit, or indeed denies it any existence. You may picture the Apostles flooded with light from their intercourse with the Master and from the proofs of His Resurrection, but blinded by the very excess of illumination, groping after the truth pre-

sented to them, seizing it in part and erroneously, seeking and attaining ever more light, guided in thought and aspiration by the Divine Spirit, gladly casting aside their earlier guesses and cramped interpretation of their message, ever advancing to new truths, recipients of a progressive revelation. It is a beautiful and attractive picture. From this beginning you may advance by two roads. The one will bring you to the conception of each several man illuminated by the Divine Spirit, that he may select and judge, approve or reject, all things presented to Him as revealed truth of God. He is the spiritual man, πνευματικὸς, who judges all things and is judged of none. That is Quakerism. The other road will bring you to the standpoint of those who believe intensely in the corporate life of the Church, who would subordinate the individual and even silence very strong convictions for the sake of unity, who see in the present state of the Catholic Church the result of an impulse originally given by Jesus Christ but modified by much weakness or perversity of men, who conceive the life of the Church as a continuous effort for the attainment of the knowledge of God,

and therefore demand a large freedom of opinion, a courageous rejection of old thoughts, a generous reception of new ideas, that the whole Church together may advance from achievement to achievement of unflinching faith. The Catholic Faith is, then, that which the Catholic Church has learnt up to the present day. That is Modernism.

I have described it in the most favourable terms that I can find. You might find others more sinister and perhaps not less true. This conception of the Catholic Faith is in the air, and enters more or less into the thought of a good many people. It has been called Modernism. The name is rather absurd. The modern man is one who is abreast with his time, not one who makes the thought of his own time the measure of truth. Nor, to do them justice, do those infected with Modernism make this mistake. They do not suppose themselves to be at the end of the quest. They are rather Futurists than Modernists. But the name has come into use, and it may serve for a time.

You will see that these two modes of thought, Quakerism and Modernism, deny or nullify the *depositum fidei*, as Scholasticism and

Calvinism deny or nullify development. Can we draw together what they separate?

You can do this if you will remember that the revelation of God is in Jesus Christ. It is not what is taught about Him, or what He taught; it is Himself. The *depositum fidei* was not a dry form of doctrine; it was the memory, tender and ardent, which the Apostles had of their Lord. Of the richness and fullness of its content they could not be aware; but it was there, and they knew it; in Him dwelt all the fullness of the Godhead bodily. What they had heard and seen, what they had touched and handled, of the Word of Life, was their gospel. But the Word was also more than they had heard or seen or touched or handled. So much they could declare. But they could do more than this. They had unconsciously assimilated habits of thought, implications of act, which became fruitful in word and deed. "I perceive that God is no respecter of persons," said St. Peter at Caesarea. He had not perceived it before, but it was implied in the sayings and doings of his Master. The Spirit brought to his remembrance, not some specific teaching on this head—that is too arid a conception for the occasion—but

something, or a hundred things, in his training as an Apostle which pointed to that conclusion. He had in memory, stored up as *depositum fidei*, the total impression made upon him by his Lord.

In this sense it is true to say that the development of the faith is nothing else but the explication of what was implicit in the deposit. What Jesus Christ really is becomes better known. The Ritschlians are right when they say that faith is an appreciation of values. But, once more, it is not the mere interpretation of an historical record, or of a portraiture. It is not achieved by the study of the Gospels, but by experience of the Christian life, the life which we live now in the flesh by the power of the Son of God. That life is the corporate life of the Church; because we are the Body of Christ we have the Spirit; he that is spiritual judges all things, says St. Paul, because "we have the mind of Christ." The mysteries of humanity, "the things of man," are intelligible to no lower being than "the spirit of man that is in him;" so the mysteries of God are intelligible only to the Spirit of God; we have received that Spirit,

"that we might know the things that are graciously bestowed on us by God." In the one Body the one Spirit searches out the deep things of God, and we know the divine glory in the face of Jesus Christ.[1]

There is, then, an original *depositum fidei*. It is the total impression made by the Lord Jesus up to the time when He departed out of this world to the Father. It was not an impression made on some exceptional men, held by them esoterically and transmitted to others for safe keeping. It was the impression made on a multitude, not large but fairly representative. Here I would have you observe the importance of the fact that even among the Apostles our Lord chose some very commonplace men. St. Paul was a man apart, St. Peter was doubtless a man of striking personality, St. John was probably a wonder of intuition; but we have no reason to suppose that the rest were in any way remarkable. If St. Paul had a tendency to exaltation, or if he be suspected of extravagance, it is well to remember that he had to accommodate himself to these ordinary persons. They all received the impression

[1] 1 Cor. ii. 10–16; 2 Cor. iv. 6.

and stored it in the tradition of the Church. They all shared the life of the Spirit which made the impression intelligible. They were all on the watch, dull and probably suspicious, against eccentricity. And as the tradition of the Church began, so it continued. How often have we been told that in the fourth century, while the brilliant and learned prelates of the East were trying to define away Arianism with endless variations of subtlety, the Faith was held and saved by the untheological piety of common men and by the uncultured bishops of the West? Remember that if the Twelve were peculiarly the witnesses of the Resurrection, St. Paul laid great stress on the testimony of the Five Hundred.

Weigh this, and you will see how impossible is the Calvinist notion that you should set aside all Christian tradition except that which is written in the canonical books of the New Testament. How could the total impression made by the Lord Jesus on the whole body of the disciples be set down by the few writers of those books? If any one had attempted this, he would have produced a rambling and inconsistent narrative, without vigour and without

conviction. None did attempt it. We have only some occasional letters and some jottings of personal memories, with detailed accounts of the Passion. There is, in consequence, a portraiture of amazing vividness and truth; a complete presentment of the incarnate Son of God there is not. But, on the other hand, bear in mind the wise words of the Bishop of Oxford about the value of this portraiture. Oral tradition is subject to peculiar dangers: it is well to be able to test its developments by reference to records all but contemporary. It will contain much that is not there, but it must not contradict what is there. Again, the Church may resolve, by a self-denying ordinance, to teach nothing as necessary for the soul's health which cannot be justified by these records. It would be false to say that the creeds of the Church can be proved by deduction from formal teaching contained in the canonical books; there are few things more pitiful than the text-twisting to which men resort in the endeavour to do this; but it is true that they are nothing more than efforts on the part of the Church to declare some details of its tradition regarding the Lord Who is vividly portrayed in those books; they are therefore

proved by the test of comparison with the portrait.

What are these creeds in relation to Catholicity? There is a Catholic tradition, which is therefore one. There are also traditions which are various, and therefore, though they may be true, not Catholic. There are creeds belonging to both sets of traditions. It seems probable that creeds were at first anything but uniform. What was their use? We must not take it for granted that the "pattern of health-giving words," which Timothy received from St. Paul to hold as a precious deposit, belongs to this kind, though the interpretation is not impossible. When we first hear of indisputable creeds, they are formularies used at baptism, by which the newly-enlightened make formal profession of their belief—the *testatio fidei* of Tertullian. In some cases the form can be pieced together from scattered references, and we then find a general similarity indeed, but also considerable variations. At the Nicene Council Eusebius of Caesarea read, for the information of the assembled fathers, the form used in his own Church. It is remarkable enough, and one might suspect it of being imbued with some of his own rhetoric,

had he not publicly stated that it was the very form used at his own baptism.[1]

It is obvious that these baptismal creeds would contain only a small part of the traditions of the various Churches. They contained, in fact, just so much as was explained to catechumens before their baptism. Instruction of exactly the same kind continued afterwards, in which the mysteries of the faith were more largely exposed. A magnificent example is extant in the Mystagogic Catechism of St. Cyril of Jerusalem ; a century earlier the catechetic schools of Alexandria were famous throughout the world. There was, therefore, a steadily maintained tradition, as concrete in the teaching of those admitted to communion as in the preparation for baptism ; but there was probably nowhere any formulary definitely summing up the more advanced instruction, because there was no occasion after baptism for a formal profession of faith. What we know as the Apostles' Creed is a rather late recension of the Roman baptismal creed : it would be absurd to suppose that the whole doctrinal tradition of the Roman Church is contained in that brief summary.

[1] Socrates, i. 8.

The several Churches had, then, their several doctrinal traditions enshrined in the formal teaching of catechumens and candidates for the sacred mysteries. Where was the Catholic Faith? In the general agreement of the Churches. How could that be guaranteed? By frequent interchange of communication. There was at first no other way, and it is remarkable that few instances of serious divergence are recorded. There might be sharp and widespread dissension, but until the end of the third century you have to look for this in connexion with matters rather practical than doctrinal; there is the dispute about the dating of Easter, and there is the quarrel between Rome and Carthage, or rather between Rome on the one side and Carthage with a considerable part of the East on the other side, about the baptism of heretics. Erroneous doctrine was common enough. Numerous petty schisms, beginning with little more than self-will or cross-grainedness, opened the way to rash speculation precisely because their adherents had the safeguard neither of local tradition nor of any common standard of teaching in the Great Church. The prophetic fervour of the Phrygian Montanists degenerated into un-

known excesses. But these vagaries were almost always confined to outsiders; the Catholicism of the Great Church did its work, and the traditions of the episcopal sees were remarkably constant.

The one great exception during the first three centuries will be found in the case of Paul of Samosata. It is important as marking the first serious failure in that method of reference to apostolic sees which Irenaeus and Tertullian recommended. For the Bishop of Antioch, the chief apostolic see of the East, was himself accused of heretical innovation; other bishops of the East, instead of referring to him for guidance, assembled in synod, condemned, and deposed him. The incident at once depressed the value of the apostolic sees and illustrated the competence of the collective episcopate. The lesson was the more emphatic because the president of the Synod was Firmilian of Caesarea, who had recently been supporting Cyprian in his dispute with the apostolic see of the West about the practice of baptism. It seems to me that the importance of this event has not been sufficiently weighed. You may see its effect fifty years later in the Arian troubles. In composing

them the authority of the apostolic sees would seem to have counted for little. Indeed the trouble arose from a challenge addressed to the second of them in dignity and influence. Arius opposed the teaching of Alexander of Alexandria, precisely as the teaching of Paul of Antioch had been opposed, and by something more than a coincidence the battle was joined in both cases about the same word. Paul had been condemned for an heretical use of the term ὁμοούσιος. There is no evidence that Alexander actually used this term, but it was certainly familiar in the catechetic tradition of his see, having been used both by his predecessor Dionysius and by Origen. The historian Socrates says that his own teaching was disfigured by ambitious philosophizing; his presbyter Arius protested, and afterwards stirred up against him several bishops of the East. The integrity of an apostolic see was in question, and once more an appeal to the collective episcopate was necessary.

The result was momentous, for a new standard of Catholicity was introduced. To understand the method of the Nicene Council we must first get a clear view of the method of Arius and his supporters. It appears in

the first encounter at Alexandria, and it continues throughout the whole struggle. Arius challenged the teaching of Alexander, first on the ground of pure dialectic, and secondly on the basis of particular texts of scripture. That is to say, he set up a standard of orthodoxy, theological and scriptural, other than that of the current tradition of the Church. From the imperfect accounts of the debates at Nicaea which have come down to us, we can ascertain that objection was taken to this method of discussion as much as to the conclusions which it induced. Dialectic and scriptural exegesis were not neglected on the orthodox side, either then or afterwards; neither would be lacking where Athanasius was concerned; but the primary appeal was to the traditional teaching of the various Churches represented, and as a result the disputed doctrine was digested into the traditionary form of a creed. Two things, however, are to be noticed. One is, that no existing baptismal creed would serve, since none touched the questions newly raised. The other is that appeal was made, as the subsequent controversy shows, not only to formal catechetics, but even more to the traditions of

worship and devotion everywhere prevailing. What decided the case against the Arians was the constant practice coming down from the days when Pliny found the Christians of Bithynia worshipping Christ as God, "carmen Christo quasi deo dicere." Never was *lex orandi* more conspicuously *lex credendi*. In the absence of any sufficient creed, a new form was drawn up. There is no reason for doubting the statement of Eusebius that his own baptismal creed of Caesarea was taken as the basis; its verbal exuberance was pruned, the necessary words were added, and it was sufficient.

Tradition, then, prevailed. And where was the novelty? It was in the use made of this new creed. It does not seem to have displaced any baptismal creed, but it was proposed to the bishops for signature as a test of orthodoxy. And this proposition continued. The example was followed; heretics, and those who would compromise with heresy, put out creed after creed during the next fifty years; the Nicene party urged consistently, in good and evil fortune, the acceptance of the Creed of the Three-hundred-and-eighteen Fathers; the worst was over when the

Acacians subscribed it, not without some characteristic criticism, at the Antiochene Synod of the year 363.

Here, I say, you have a new standard of Catholicity : they are Catholic who consent to a formulary of faith. If this were fixed once for all time, the tradition of the Church would become a dead tradition of the letter, and would cease to be Catholic. It is not so fixed. You must not think of one creed, or three creeds, as declaring the whole counsel of God for all time. All through the ages you will find the work of the Nicene Council being renewed ; heretical innovations will be met by a fresh formulation of the traditionary teaching of the Church, and each new formulary may become a test of Catholicity. Some will be found erroneous and cast aside ; some will be of merely temporary use ; some will have a mere local interest, as meeting a local heresy ; some will survive their usefulness, like the English Thirty-nine Articles ; but some will remain a possession for all time. We are not tied to words ; the same term, as in the case of ὁμοούσιος, may be condemned in one sense and afterwards approved in another sense. Still less are additions barred ; the anger of the

Easterns against the enrichment of the *filioque* is not in the temper of Catholicity; it might, perhaps, be right to abandon the added words if that were the one thing needed for the unifying of the Church, but the addition must not be condemned as false. That which is permanent in all such articles of faith is the standard of Catholicity. It is not to be distinguished by any cut-and-dried rules. Catholicity is too large for such methods. It has to be ascertained with labour and with patience. The Catholicity of the simple man lies in the acceptance, not necessarily uncritical but patient and humble, of what is proposed by authority.

By authority: that is the point. For a *dogma* is a law: there is no escape from that. The word was used in the Greek schools of philosophy for that kind of settled conviction, allowed as starting-point, without which progress of thought is impossible. But in the Church it stands for more than this; a dogma is not merely what Christians in general agree to accept as true, for the word is here used in its other sense of a decree; it is decreed by authority that none shall rank as an orthodox member of the Church who does not accept this or that doctrine. M. Le Roy gives an

incomplete account of it when he makes it mean only that I shall comport myself as if the doctrine were true. Something more is required of me. It is idle to object that belief cannot be commanded ; I am either convinced or not convinced, and no command can alter the fact. That is self-evident. But the social authority of the Church can decree that if I am not convinced, or at least if I deny, I lose the title of Catholic. That is to undertake a tremendous responsibility ; but that, and nothing less, is the meaning of a dogmatic definition.

The *Commonitorium* of St. Vincent of Lerinum was written, in or about the year 434, when this new mode of Catholicity was well established, and it remains as good an explanation of it as can be found. But do not stop at the brief canon of Catholicity with which he begins : "Ut id teneamus quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est." It is easy to misunderstand this if you do not read what follows. Nothing could be further from the thought of the author than a static, unchanging standard of orthodoxy. It distinguishes the deposit of faith and the development, *profectus*, of religion. The deposit is what has been entrusted to you, not discovered by you, what

you have received, not thought out for yourself: "Id quod tibi creditum est, non quod a te inuentum, quod tibi creditum est, non quod excogitasti; rem, non ingenii, sed doctrinae; non usurpationis priuatae, sed publicae traditionis; rem ad te perductam, non a te prolatam; in qua non auctor debes esse, sed custos; non institutor, sed sectator; non ducens, sed sequens." It is more than the original revelation; it is that revelation as it has reached you, and you are to hand it on with such polish and illustration as you can achieve; but it must be the same that you received: "Eadem tamen quae didicisti doce; ut, cum dicas noue, non dicas noua."

There is, therefore, *profectus*, a development of the deposit. In describing this the author uses with imperfect physiological knowledge the analogy of animal growth. He looks only to the change from youth to age, insisting on the numerical identity of members throughout, and knowing nothing of growth from the single cell. Yet he may glance at something like this when he presses the point, "Ut nihil nouum postea proferatur in senibus, quod non in pueris ante latitauerit." It is true that every feature of adult manhood was potentially con-

tained in the *ovum*; and, when you apply the analogy, it is true that every dogma of the Catholic Faith is potentially contained in the impression made on the disciples by Jesus Christ. Otherwise it is not Catholic. But the development is a real growth. The author of the *Commonitorium* states exactly the nature of the passage from the Catholicity of oral tradition to the Catholicity of formularies. What the Church did in the definitions made necessary by heretical innovations was just this: "Ut quod prius a maioribus sola traditione susceperat, hoc deinde etiam per scripturae chirographum consignaret." But how should the new definition, the written rule of faith, the χειρόγραφον of the Church, be devised? He answers by reference to the procedure of the Ephesine Council which had lately condemned Nestorius. There is much of sinister import in the history of that Council, but what he lays stress on is the method professedly followed, the irreproachable cover under which haste and personal animosity were veiled. The Council, he says, gathered up the threads of continuous tradition from various parts of the Church, calling in evidence three Bishops of Alexandria, three of the great Cappadocians,

two Bishops of Rome, one of Carthage, and one of Milan.[1] These were accepted as representative men, and their tradition was confirmed. He applauds the modesty of the assembled fathers, many of them learned theologians, "quibus ipsa in unum congregatio audendi ab se aliquid et statuendi addere uideretur fiduciam," who nevertheless resolved to claim no such power, but only to pass on to posterity that which they had received. It is an idealistic picture, on which Theodoret could have painted some shadows, but it sets out what we need. He establishes the principles on which conciliar definitions of the faith should be constructed.

Such definitions have been made, and thenceforth heresy has a new character. It is no longer mere waywardness of temper ; it is the definite rejection of what has been defined. And, correlatively, Catholicity also takes a new colour. You may not like it. You may think the earlier mode of tradition, the free movement of thought under the guidance of the Spirit, a nobler thing. You may deprecate

[1] He enumerates these ten. Twelve were in fact cited by the Council, Atticus of Constantinople and Amphilochius of Iconium being added to those whom he mentions.

fresh definitions, and the closing of open questions. But you cannot go back to the older conditions, nor finally stop the march of development. Heresies have made the mode of definition a necessity. We are perforce dogmatic, and Catholicity lies in the generous acceptance of that necessity.

IV

THE ELEMENT OF LARGENESS

I RETURN this week to the fundamental notion of universality. We have seen that Christian doctrine, to be Catholic, must be continuous. That does not mean that it shall be always identically the same in expression. A word which is at one time condemned as heretical may at another time become the very watchword of the Faith, and the process may less easily be reversed. The shiftings of the terms οὐσία and ὑπόστασις are sufficient illustration. But Catholic doctrine must be continuous in the sense that it is drawn by tradition from the original revelation, which is the total impression made by the Life and Death and Resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ. An entirely new thought, though it be true, and though it be closely connected with that revelation, will not be Catholic, since it is not in the tradition ; if it be urged as a part of the genuine Christian tradition

it may be condemned as heretical; if it seem to contradict the tradition it may be condemned, whether urged in that fashion or not, as rash or as false. So much is involved in the conception of Catholicity as a continuing unity of the Faith through time and beyond.

But there is another way of marring Catholicity. As there is uncatholic innovation, so also there is an uncatholic conservatism. Definition has almost always been taken in hand reluctantly, as heresy made it necessary; it has almost always been opposed, not only by the heretics against whom it is directed, but also by others who affect the vaguer teaching previously sufficient. Such men are often the very salt of the earth, faithful, devout, humble-minded, the solid underprop of orthodoxy. Their opposition may be invaluable as checking the ardour of controversy, which is apt to rebound from an error confuted into a contradiction not less erroneous. They may have to be overruled, but if such men had been heard more patiently at Ephesus, in the day of Cyril's triumph, there might have been no call twenty years later for the complementary judgement of Chalcedon. They

have to be overruled, because the challenge of heresy, when raised and pressed home, makes it impossible to stand in the ancient ways. A point is reached where silence becomes the suppression of truth. It has to be stated what is the tradition of the Church and what it means. If the statement is not made, a part of the tradition, challenged and disputed, may be lost altogether as tradition. But to hold one part of the truth to the exclusion of another part, even without the least intermingling of falsehood, is no less heretical than to deny one part of the truth or to corrupt it with falsehood. The Catholic Faith is the tenure of the whole truth revealed in the Lord Jesus Christ; Catholicity is the quality in Church or in man by which the whole is held fast.

The full richness of the content of that revelation can never be defined. To suppose that possible is to attribute not only to the human mind, but also to the language employed as instrument of thought, a capacity which it almost certainly does not possess. Therefore, merely to hold what has been defined is to fall short of Catholicity. You may say more. In all definition there

is a risk of obscuring the richness of the content. In proportion as your attention is directed to what has been defined, it may be drawn away from the rest. Engaged in saving one part of the content, you may lose sight of other parts. There is such a thing as uncatholic dogmatism, into which you may drop without swerving by a hair's breadth from the truth. It seems to me that we are just now peculiarly exposed to this danger. We stand in defence of this and that defined truth, this and that dogma, until our attention is so concentrated on these that the Catholic Faith comes to mean for us a poor little group of unrelated beliefs. You will sometimes discover the most eccentric opinions lurking in the mind of one who is a noted champion of orthodoxy; he is like the specialist in history, who may have the wildest notions about events and characters that do not belong to his period. Even if room be not made for eccentricity, such concentration of attention produces a dangerous narrowness. A Roman cardinal once said to me, in deprecation of the discussion of a certain subject, "What is the use of talking about these things? The Pope is what matters." It

was quite true. There does constantly emerge in times of controversy some one thing that matters, one thing on which all hinges, an *articulus stantis aut cadentis*. It may be an iota: then you must stand firm by that letter. But you cease to be Catholic if you become unable to think of anything else.

So the process of definition is as dangerous as it is necessary. It is necessary, and therefore the danger must be faced; you must try to retain your Catholicity.

Catholicity is the will to have and to hold the full richness of the content of revelation—to have Christ, and in Christ to have all truth. St. Paul avowed the Catholicity of his teaching when he told the Ephesine presbyters, "I have not shrunk from declaring to you the whole counsel of God." He did not mean that he had set out in human speech all divine truth; he had himself seen in ecstasy things beyond the scope of language. His message had limitations. The counsel of God, ἡ βουλὴ τοῦ Θεοῦ, is here, as elsewhere in St. Luke's writings, the plan of salvation determined by the will of God; and so to declare this counsel is neither more nor less than to preach the Gospel.

St. Paul averred that he had declared it in its entirety. But again, he did not mean that he had set out the whole, even of this, in final dogmatic form. The purport of his avowal is evident. He had not shrunk (ὑποστέλλειν) from declaring all; he had made no timid reserves. He was thinking of the compromise with Jewish opponents, which an unworthy prudence would have dictated. This shrinking, this cowardly compliance, is precisely what he laid to the charge of Peter at Antioch[1]; a timorous conservatism would have kept something in the background; to be held implicitly, no doubt, but not to be definitely proclaimed as the purpose of God. The Gospel was already preached, with all its implications, before St. Peter went to Caesarea, but if it were still preached exactly as then it would be a poor maimed thing; for the question of the admission of the Gentiles was come to the fore, and to shirk it was to cut the Gospel short. St. Paul declared the counsel of God in its entirety as required for the needs of the moment.

His entirety would not be entire now, any

[1] Gal. ii. 12, ὑπέστελλε.

more than was the entirety of the first years at Jerusalem entire for the time when he was speaking. This does not mean that we have a larger faith than his. The *profectus religionis* of St. Vincent of Lerinum is of another sort. We do not believe more ; we do not even know more in substance ; but discursively we do know more. And the knowledge is burdensome. In proportion as we know more discursively the content of revelation, we are the more in danger of leaning on some details and neglecting others. St. Paul could fearlessly tell in passionate words how the Lord of Glory emptied Himself. When you have a laboured theology of the *kenosis*, you can hardly speak of the subject at all without stumbling into heresy.

Our Catholicity, therefore, must be broad ; not really broader than that of St. Paul, of St. Athanasius, of St. Leo, but consciously broader because consciously embracing details to which they paid no attention. It will include details at which they would probably have shaken their heads ; for St. Paul at Ephesus had no more reached finality than St. Peter at Antioch. It must be theologically broad. We might prefer not to be theological

at all, but we cannot help ourselves, and we have to see to it that our theology is Catholic. You must not tie it to the first century or to the fourth, or to the first six centuries, to the age of the Fathers or to the Seven General Councils, to the Alexandrians or to the Africans, to the Schoolmen or to the Caroline divines. Least of all must you give it a national hedge, adjust the Word of God to the focus of German lenses, or the mysteries of the faith to the standard of English common sense. All these are ways of narrowness. Abjure Anglicanism as heartily as Romanism. Catholicity is breadth.

Yet there is nothing smaller and more pitiful than the affectation of breadth. It consists almost invariably in marking out some limit within which you allow yourself a freedom which others do not claim. The result is that the space within which you expatiate, the space between your limit and that of other people, becomes the whole world to you. It is usually a very narrow space, and enlargement comes to mean just the privilege of walking on those flagstones. It is as though the garrison of the outworks of a fortress should plume themselves on the larger scope of their opera-

tions, as compared with those within the main walls. It is wider on the map, but their actual manœuvring ground may be much smaller. The analogy is very imperfect ; I will not press it, for it is enough to say, without figurative speech, that breadth of theological thought is secured, not by freedom from definition, but by fullness of content. Pure theism is not fuller and richer than the orthodox doctrine of the Holy Trinity ; it has a comparatively poor and thin content. Everything which it contains is in the other, and much more. Intellectual breadth may even be attained by increasing fullness of definition ; the chemistry of to-day is a much bigger thing than the primitive theory of the four elements. It is not quite the same with faith, for the primitive Christianity of the Upper Room at Pentecost was as wide and all-embracing as the doctrine of the Angel of the Schools ; but when once definition has made progress you achieve breadth of thought by articulate synthesis of propositions, and not by a general merger. Enlargement is the filling-up of the sight of the eyes, not an extension of the wanderings of desire. Some schemes for uniting Christians on an undogmatic basis are like an invitation

to congregate on the point of a needle. Angel hosts may balance themselves there, but hardly a great company of men.

You may think that I am using modern language and purely modern conceptions. I should have no objection to this, but in point of fact I am doing no such thing. An illustration from the fourth century will show it. I shall not go to the Alexandrians, whose tendency to a kind of syncretism might be suspect. I will call in witness St. Cyril of Jerusalem, whose sympathies were with the literal school of Antioch, and with the stiff conservatism that inspired much of the opposition to the Nicene definition. He is instructing the newly-baptized on the style of the Church. It is called Catholic, he says, in the first place because of its extension throughout the world ; but he then adds three other explanations of the term. I shall have occasion to cite them all, but the first alone will serve my immediate purpose. The Church is called Catholic, he says, because it teaches generally and unfailingly all the defined doctrines which ought to be brought to men's knowledge, about things visible and invisible, in heaven and in earth : *Διὰ τὸ διδάσκειν καθολικῶς καὶ ἀνελλιπῶς ἅπαντα*

τὰ εἰς γνῶσιν ἀνθρώπων ἐλθεῖν ὀφείλοντα δόγματα, περί τε ὁρατῶν καὶ ἀοράτων πραγμάτων, ἐπουρανίων τε καὶ ἐπιγείων.[1] Whether you can safely throw this idea back to become historically a part of the original content of the term as applied to the Christian Church may well be doubted; I am concerned only to show that it was already current in the fourth century as part of the meaning which the word then expressed. I shall have spent my labour in vain if I have not convinced you that Cyril was right in making this a part of the logical content of Catholicity. The Catholic Faith is not only that which is taught by the whole Church throughout the world; it is that system of doctrine which sets out as fully as possible, and as definitely as the needs of the time require, the whole meaning of the Christian revelation. The twofold explanation is important; for, if geographical extension were alone in view, the Catholic Faith would be just that which is in fact taught by continuous tradition in every part of the Christian Church alike. Even this would be an imposing body of doctrine, but more is required. You might very well find in one part of the Church a complete neglect

[1] *Catech.* xviii. 33.

or forgetfulness of some definite teaching which the experience of another part of the Church proves to be necessary for guarding the full content of revelation. To exclude that doctrine, or to deny its necessity because the necessity has not been universally experienced, would be an uncatholic judgement. To do so at the cost of a breach in the practical unity of the Church would be an heretical judgement. Two things are equally uncatholic—to press as Catholic a definite doctrine which is not verified by continuous tradition as part of the Christian revelation, and to reject a doctrine that is so verified because definition has not universally been found necessary.

This seems to require illustration by example. I will try to construct one which shall be as little controversial as possible. The Latin Churches of the fourth century might with some reason have pleaded that they had no need of the Nicene definition; the questions in dispute were due to the subtleties of Greek thought and of the Greek language, and did not concern them; if they had on this ground rejected the definition, they would have acted in a most uncatholic manner, and would indeed have imperilled the

Faith. But you may object to the history of things that did not happen, and demand an example from real life. I would then refer you reluctantly to the rejection of the dogmatic decree of Chalcedon by the Armenians. They pleaded—with reason, say some good authorities—that in their language the heresy of Eutyches had no meaning, and the definition with which it was countered could not be intelligibly expressed. So far they may have been right; they put themselves in the wrong when they rejected the definition which was necessary both for Greeks and for Latins, emphasizing their rejection by a breach of communion, and by the symbolism of liturgical peculiarities. I do not see how they can escape the charge of heresy. Even their Greek neighbours, I believe, accuse them of no positive error, and with some reserves admit them to communion; but there is such a thing as negative heresy, the refusal of a definite doctrine which has been found necessary for safeguarding the full content of the Christian revelation.

I have chosen these remote examples; you may possibly find something of the same kind nearer home.

Catholicity, then, is the temper that avoids narrowness in the field of doctrine, the narrowness that comes of a timid conservatism, of concentration upon certain dogmatic definitions, of a restricted outlook, or of studied vagueness. But it is not only in the field of doctrine that Catholicity is to be found. Life is much more than thought, and the Christian life is much more than formulated belief. Even in the field of doctrine we have seen that the loss of Catholicity sometimes becomes apparent only when thought, or the refusal to think, begets public action. It is in public action, the life of the Christian community, that the Catholic temper is most important and most manifest.

I return to St. Cyril of Jerusalem. The Church is called Catholic, he says, because it brings into holy obedience every class of men, rulers and ruled, learned and simple. That will not help me much, except to the obvious remark that a "Labour Church" will have some difficulty in proving itself Catholic, and that one which frowns on culture, or contentedly fails to be the Church of the poor, has a very imperfect Catholicity.

Let us pass on. The Church is called

Catholic, he continues, because it ministers an universal remedy for every kind of sin, of soul or of body, and because it has in possession every kind of virtue that can be named, in act and word and spiritual gift: Καὶ διὰ τὸ καθολικῶς ἰατρεύειν μὲν καὶ θεραπεύειν ἅπαν τὸ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν εἶδος, τῶν διὰ ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος ἐπιτελουμένων, κεκτῆσθαι δὲ ἐν αὐτῇ πᾶσαν ἰδέαν ὀνομαζομένης ἀρετῆς, ἐν ἔργοις τε καὶ λόγοις καὶ πνευματικοῖς παντοίοις χαρίσμασι. Here is a conception of Catholicity which has but to be stated, and you see at once how true it must needs be. This revelation of God in the Lord Jesus Christ was designed for the destruction of the works of the devil, and for the salvation of all human souls. The Church which is the steward of the mysteries of that revelation cannot do its service if any kind of sin lies beyond the province of its healing ministry. The salvation of mankind means the sanctification of all human affections, all human efforts, all human powers and virtues; not only the peculiar virtues of the elect, but the glory and honour of the nations also are to adorn the City of God.

Yet in the history of Christianity you will

find much that conflicts with this conception of Catholicity; much that breaks out into open heresy and schism, much also that manages to keep within the borders of Catholicism. Here let me put in a word of caution. You will not unfrequently find Catholics doing very uncatholic things; you are not therefore to deny the name of Catholic either to them or to the Church which more or less willingly tolerates them. You will find many in the Church doing unholy things, but they are not the less saints in the making, and the Church is not the less holy. Holiness and Catholicity are on the same footing, both as necessary qualities of the Church, and as qualities which are very imperfectly in evidence. The Church is One, Holy, Catholic, Apostolic. Why should you expect any one of these qualities to be more completely or more inevitably brought to fruition than the rest? In a sense all are alike inevitable, indestructible. The Church is one, for there is none other; that one Church is sanctified by the indwelling Spirit; it is indestructibly apostolic by origin and by tradition; it is of necessity Catholic in more than one of the senses which we have been

considering; but the flower and fruit of all four qualities will be achieved only by those efforts of faulty fellow-workers with God, in which there is always mingled some defect of human weakness, and often some strength of human perversity.

I put in this caution here because I am going to speak of a kind of Catholicity which is at times sadly to seek in Catholicism. Hitherto we have been considering matters in respect of which uncatholic thought or conduct leads pretty straight to heresy or schism. It is in part the same with what we now have before us, but not entirely. In the writings of Hermas you will find the earliest surviving mention of a doctrine about sin which made great trouble in the Church for some centuries. His advocacy established an opinion, already current, that for grave sins committed after baptism there could be no absolution.[1] Adultery or fornication, idolatry and murder, were thus irremediable. The structure of a sentence made it possible, though not without violence to the context, to interpret his "one penitence," which was baptism, of one opportunity after baptism;

[1] *Mandat.* iv. 3–7.

and this illogical compromise was much favoured. In either form such rigour was a denial of the Catholicity of the means of grace. When bishops of the third century broke away from it, and notably Callistus and Cornelius of Rome, they were violently opposed. The first antipopes were then set up. The schism of Hippolytus was short-lived, but that of Novatian lasted for more than four centuries. It spread from Rome to the East, for everywhere the narrower and more severe discipline found advocates who quarrelled with the laxity of the Great Church. They called themselves the Clean, Καθαροί, and seem to have been generally—unlike many of their kind—men of genuine austerity, and otherwise strictly orthodox. Others, however, were yet more austere in profession. The Montanists pretended to derive from the spiritual gifts that were peculiar to them a practical holiness distinguishing them from the mere "psychic men" who were tolerated in the Great Church. Donatism sprang from the same root, for it began with a denial of the power of the Church to grant a plenary absolution for the sin of weak compliance in time of persecution, and its principle was rigid exclusion from the

Church of all who fell short of an arbitrary standard of excellence.[1]

These three great schisms did but exaggerate the hardness already established in the Church. If they have had no successors, it is because the Church itself shook off the burden of unevangelic sternness. The discipline which is inaccurately called primitive passed away; those who sigh for its revival probably know little of its character. It made a hard and fast distinction, and a highly artificial distinction, between sins for which penance might be done and sins for which there could be no absolution. The Catholicity of grace was ultimately asserted, never more, let us hope, to be questioned. It must be confessed, however, that the laxity of some Jesuit casuists caused an unlovely reaction in Jansenism.

The doctrine of penance has ethical as well as sacramental connexions. A measure of the guilt of sin is also a standard of virtue. To say that some sins might be remitted to the penitent, while others might not, was to set up a particular standard of virtue in the Church. There you have all the evils of a partial morality. This trouble, in one form or

[1] See Appendix B.

another, is of constant recurrence. Sometimes it takes the form of a notion that certain sins will not count against a Christian; sins of the flesh, for example, are nothing to one who is in the Spirit. You will find that only in fanatical sects, or lurking perhaps among Catholic Christians who have been infected by their neighbours. At other times it appears in the more subtle form of the assumption of certain peculiar Christian virtues, the practice of which makes the Christian character, though other virtues be neglected. This is one of the familiar features of Pharisaism, as condemned in the Gospel. It is seldom far away in the Christian Church.

Is there a specific Christian morality? If there is, then Christianity is so far not Catholic. But Christianity is Catholic. As there is no part of the earth to which it lays no claim, no class of men for whom it has no call, so also there is no kind of human virtue which it does not take in charge. But Catholic Christianity transcends the limits of the world and of human life. So also it transcends morality; transcending morality, it has knowledge and experience of the heroic development of virtue which is supernatural

sanctity. But in transcending the world it does not pass out of the world, and in achieving sanctity it does not forget the common virtues of human life. In this region it has no new revelation. The moral teaching of the Gospel does not differ in kind from that of the world. It is only steadier and more intense. You will find some people disturbed and shocked by the discovery that the noblest sayings of the Gospel in regard to conduct can be matched in the teaching of Indian or Chinese sages; that the Golden Rule was enunciated with but little difference by Confucius or Lao-Tse. They will pathetically insist on minute verbal differences, as if the value of the Gospel depended on the uniqueness of its moral precepts. But that is all wrong. In the preaching of the Gospel there is a direct and confident appeal to the moral convictions of those who are addressed. Because such convictions exist everywhere in the world of men, and because their foundations are everywhere the same, the appeal of the Gospel can go straight to all hearts. There are mistaken values to be corrected everywhere, as there were in the Temple of Jerusalem and in the schools of the Pharisees;

there are sectarian moralities to be set aside; but the correction is made by reference to a larger rule which the sectarian mind will acknowledge. When our Lord told the Pharisees, "These things ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone," He was referring to a duty which they would not dream of disputing. When I was the guest of the Oxford Mission at Calcutta some years ago, I observed how constantly the worst perversions of Hindu morality could be corrected by reference to rules of conduct which Hindus themselves steadily and even passionately affirm. The ethical teaching of the Gospel rests on the broad base of natural morality.

But transcends it. The transcendence appears in two forms. First, there is the transcendent motive of the love of God. But this is not purely transcendent, for what moves us is the love of God revealed in the human life and death of the Incarnate Word. Secondly, there is the transcendent teaching of the counsels of perfection; we are invited to a perfection of character surpassing the limits of natural morality at its best. But neither is this purely transcendent. The call

of the saint is not to live a life apart, in a spiritual nirvana; the supernatural virtues of sanctity operate in the ordinary circumstances of human life. The Catholicity of the Christian religion links together the now and the hereafter, the here and the beyond.

The distinction between precepts of morality and counsels of perfection is important from our present point of view. Catholic Christianity must take count of both in due proportion. The sense of proportion may be lost in two ways. You may forget the continuity of human life in which the saints pass on from natural to supernatural virtue; you will then make a chasm between the two, and treat natural perfection as the final goal of ordinary Christians. That is the danger of theories of supererogation. On the other hand, you may put the natural virtues outside the pale of proper Christianity. Professor Burkitt claims to have found evidence that the Church of Edessa at one time restricted baptism to those who would live in virginity or widowhood. That restriction would be just as uncatholic as the claim of the Montanists that their "pneumatic men" were alone true Christians.

In modern times the denial of the distinction between precepts of morality and counsels of perfection has been characteristic of Puritanism. What is the peculiarity of Puritanism? Not its austerity of life and manners, real or assumed. Equal austerity, real or assumed, has always been found in many who have no link with Puritanism. The peculiarity of Puritanism is the contention, derived from Calvin, that a precise code of manners proper to a Christian can be gathered from the revealed Word of God. The system is all of a piece. Christian doctrine is precisely set out in the canonical books of the New Testament, and must be reinforced from no other source; Christian worship and the Christian sacraments are ordered with a like precision; and finally there is a Christian morality of the same arbitrary type. The strength of Puritanism, in the days when it was strong, lay in this affirmation of an absolute law regulating every detail of human life. Its weakness lay in the artificiality of the result. The refusal to distinguish between natural morality and supernatural sanctity, between precepts of conduct and counsels of perfection, made it necessary to reduce the harder sayings of the Gospel

into practicable obligations — or indeed to ignore them altogether. George Fox denounced the Puritans of his day as false to their principle; they did not live according to the teaching of the Gospel. Their only answer was the whipping-post and the stocks.

Puritanism, therefore, was a sectarian morality. It has long since broken down at all points, but its ruins are among us. One does not care to drag out a silly phrase once uttered in a moment of excitement, but if there be such a thing as a Nonconformist Conscience, it is certainly a thing to beware of. Only you must be equally on guard against any other kind of sectarian conscience. Pharisaism is a deadly snare. Suspect yourself of it when you find yourself calling a man a "good Churchman" without regard to his conduct of business, when you extoll his charities but veil the sources of his income, when you absolve a sinner who confesses delinquencies against the laws of fasting but is untroubled in conscience about a neglected family. The large temper of Catholicity should save you from this pettiness. That, and the charity which ensues.

I have said that the Catholic Church is, and

must be, intolerant. It can tolerate no rival, neither Caesar nor sect. Just because it is Catholic it must fill the field. Neither can it tolerate any pantheon. It has always raised the cry which Islam lifts to a sterile elevation, "There is no god but God." And yet how tolerant is the temper of Catholicity! Intolerant of evil, of that which would mar its own perfect unity, it extends the most generous welcome to all that is imperfectly good. The sectarian temper is harsh, repellent, exclusive. Its intolerance is a mockery of the intolerance of the Catholic Church, for it affects uniqueness and unity by driving out all who will not conform to an arbitrary standard. Catholics often do uncatholic things, and the exercise of the power of excommunication by the most unimpeachably Catholic authority may be an exhibition of this sectarian temper. Indeed *corruptio optimi pessima*, and there is no sectarianism, no Pharisaism, worse than that of Catholics when they become sectarian. Though they be entrenched in Catholicism, their Catholicity is lost. That temper, while intact, embraces in the largest charity every effort towards holiness, every attempt to grasp the truth. In these days

of disunion, more especially, it will recognize as of the Church many who are apparently very far from being within the Church. We must still declare that *extra ecclesiam nulla salus*, and that he who would be saved must before all things hold fast the Catholic Faith, but we must also confess that many fulfil this condition in reality whose mode of salvation it would be difficult to define in word.

The relation of largeness in faith and morals to Catholicity must be taken the right way. You do not become Catholic merely by being unsectarian. No such mere negative has any value. Rather it is by being Catholic that you become unsectarian. You are a Christian, and therefore you are Catholic unless your Christianity is marred by the sectarian temper.

APPENDIX A

CATHEDRA PETRI

THERE is at Rome a venerable relic honoured under the name of *Cathedra Sancti Petri*. It is a chair, dating in its present form from the ninth or tenth century, but constructed on a framework which is much older. Its history can be traced back pretty clearly to the time of St. Damasus, and more obscurely, but with considerable probability, to the first century. It is now enclosed in the monstrous erection designed by Bernini for the apse of the Vatican Basilica. In the fourth century it seems to have been in the Baptistery of Damasus, and there is a respectable tradition connecting it with the house of Pudens, the earliest of the domestic churches of Rome, now known by a grammatical confusion as St. Pudentiana, where it is supposed to have been actually used by the Apostle himself when presiding in the assembly of the faithful.[1]

[1] On these points the two great authorities De Rossi and Duchesne are at variance. See Duchesne, *Origines*, p. 268 (Engl. tr., p. 280).

A similar relic is venerated in a chapel of the Ostrian catacomb on the Via Nomentana, a chair hewn out of the solid rock, the use of which is also attributed to the Apostle; but this belongs almost certainly to the second century, and there is no evidence of its veneration at any early date.

Two festivals of the *Cathedra Sancti Petri* are observed at Rome, on January 18th and February 22nd, which it seems natural to connect with these two relics. The second is now known as the Feast of the Chair of St. Peter *at Antioch*; but this seems to be due to a mere blunder, arising from the fact that in some martyrologies the Antiochene martyr St. Gallus was commemorated on the same day. On this day, in point of fact, the relic of the Ostrian cemetery is specially venerated. But the connexion of the festivals with the relics breaks down when we observe, first, that nothing either in breviary or missal looks that way; and, secondly, that the feast of January 18th was unknown at Rome until introduced by Paul IV in the year 1558. The festival of February 22nd can be traced back to the year 336; it seems to have been unknown in Africa and in the East, but made its way into

Gaul during the fifth century. The Churches of the Gallican rite afterwards removed it to an earlier day in January, apparently for the purpose of keeping it out of Lent; in the sixteenth century, as I have said, this observance was imported to Rome as a second festival, the latest example of that conflation of Roman and Gallican elements which has been the cause of so much ritual perplexity.

There seem, therefore, to be no grounds for connecting the festivals with the relics. What, then, is the meaning of *Cathedra Sancti Petri* as here used? Two uses of the word *cathedra* present themselves; it is the Seat either of the teacher or of rule. The meaning may be either symbolic or literal. In the Gospel the members of the Sanhedrim are said to sit ἐπὶ τῆς Μωσέως καθέδρας.[1] Tertullian speaks of the *cathedrae apostolorum* in the various Churches expressly founded by Apostles, as Corinth, Philippi, Thessalonica, Ephesus, and Rome, which "adhuc suis locis praesident."[2] This must mean that the teaching or ruling authority in such a Church is regarded as continuing in some special sense the work of the founder.

[1] St. Matt. xxiii. 2. [2] *De Praescr.* 36.

The implication is that the seat of authority would be called at Corinth *Cathedra Pauli*, at Rome probably *Cathedra Petri et Pauli*. In the introduction to the Clementine Homilies St. Peter is made to say that he entrusted to Clement τὴν ἐμὴν τῶν λογῶν καθέδραν—as a modern might say, "my pulpit"—for in this heretical document St. Paul is studiously depressed. The phrase may indicate, however, the currency of the term *Cathedra Petri*, the earliest known occurrence of which is found, so far as I am aware, in the writings of St. Cyprian. It is a familiar story that the text of the fourth chapter of his treatise *De Catholicae Ecclesiae Unitate* was for centuries in a state of confusion, due to supposed interpolations, and that discreditable means were used to prevent the removal of these blemishes from the principal editions. The critical labours of Hartel, however, have shown that certain manuscripts of the eighth and ninth century contained side by side two distinct texts of the passage, a blending of which caused all the subsequent confusion. It is at least possible that both are Cyprian's, being drawn from two editions of the work issued by him. I am concerned with them merely because in one

text the phrase *Cathedra Petri* occurs ; but to make the matter clear I will set down both, the one as given by Hartel in his definitive edition, the other as reconstituted by him from the above-mentioned manuscripts in his Critical Preface, p. xlii.

A

Loquitur Dominus ad Petrum : *Ego tibi dico*, inquit, *quia tu es Petrus et super istam petram aedificabo ecclesiam meam, et portae inferorum non uincent eam ; dabo tibi claues regni caelorum : et quae ligaueris super terram erunt ligata et in caelis, et quaecumque solueris super terram erunt soluta et in caelis.* Super unum aedificat ecclesiam, et quamuis apostolis omnibus post resurrectionem suam parem potestatem tribuat et dicat : *Sicut misit me pater et ego mitto uos. Accipite Spiritum sanctum : si cuius remiseritis peccata, remittentur illi : si cuius tenueritis, tenebuntur*, tamen ut unitatem manifestaret, unitatis eiusdem originem ab uno incipientem sua auctoritate disposuit. Hoc erant utique

B

Loquitur Dominus ad Petrum : *Ego tibi dico*, inquit, *quia tu es Petrus et super istam petram aedificabo ecclesiam meam, et portae inferorum non uincent eam ; dabo tibi claues regni caelorum : et quae ligaueris super terram erunt ligata et in caelis, et quaecumque solueris super terram erunt soluta et in caelis.* Et idem post resurrectionem suam dicit : *pasce oues meas.* Super unum aedificat ecclesiam et illi pascendas oues mandat suas, et quamuis apostolis omnibus parem tribuat potestatem, unam tamen cathedram constituit et unitatis originem atque rationem sua auctoritate disposuit. Hoc erant utique et ceteri quod Petrus, sed primatus Petro datur ut una ecclesia et cathedra una

et ceteri apostoli quod fuit Petrus, pari consortio praediti et honoris et potestatis, sed exordium ab unitate proficiscitur, ut ecclesia Christi una monstretur. Quam unam ecclesiam etiam in cantico canticorum Spiritus sanctus ex persona Domini designat et dicit: *una est columba mea, perfecta mea, una est matri suae, electa genetrici suae.* Hanc ecclesiae unitatem qui non tenet tenere se fidem credit? qui ecclesiae renititur et resistit in ecclesia se esse confidit? quando et beatus apostolus Paulus hoc idem doceat et sacramentum unitatis ostendat dicens: *unum corpus et unus spiritus, una spes uocationis uestrae, unus Dominus, una fides, unum baptisma, unus Deus.*

monstretur. Et pastores sunt omnes, sed grex unus ostenditur, qui ab apostolis omnibus unanimi consensione pascatur. Hanc et Pauli unitatem qui non tenet, tenere se fidem credit? qui cathedram Petri super quam fundata ecclesia est deserit, in ecclesia se esse confidit?[1] . . . quando et beatus apostolus Paulus hoc idem doceat et sacramentum unitatis ostendat dicens: *unum corpus et unus spiritus, una spes uocationis uestrae, unus Dominus, una fides, unum baptisma, unus Deus.*

[1] Here follows in the manuscripts collated by Hartel the whole of the corresponding passage in text A: "Super unum *aedificauit* ecclesiam, et quamuis . . . se esse confidit." This duplication is noted by Hartel as proving that text B is a forged interpolation, and he has been followed with more vehemence and scorn by a sometime Archbishop of Canterbury. It seems to me, on the contrary, a signal proof of honesty in some *librarius*, who, being acquainted with two recensions of the passage, thought it well to put both faithfully, though clumsily, before the reader.

Why this text B should have been attacked as a deliberate falsification, made in the interest of the Roman See, I cannot understand. If any one so altered the text of St. Cyprian for the purpose of maintaining the cause of the Papacy, he did the work very negligently. There is rather more about Peter, rather less about the other Apostles, and the word *primatus* is used; but on the other hand the crucial words *parem tribuat potestatem* remain to negative the idea that Peter received any power which was not shared equally with the rest. The phrase *cathedra Petri* alone could have the intended effect, and that only if it indicated the apostolic See of Rome as a necessary "centre of unity;" but this would clash with the main argument of the treatise, left intact by the supposed interpolator, which finds the *sacramentum unitatis* in the *episcopatus unus adque indiuisus*.

In what sense, then, does St. Cyprian use the term *cathedra Petri* here or elsewhere? It is found in one passage only of his undisputed writings. Complaining to Cornelius of Rome about the Carthaginian malcontents, who had appealed thither from his judgement

condemning them, he describes their procedure thus :

> Pseudoepiscopo sibi ab haereticis constituto nauigare audent et ad Petri cathedram adque ad ecclesiam principalem unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est ab schismaticis et profanis litteras ferre.[1]

This passage presents some obvious difficulties. It is easy to see why the Roman Church is called *ecclesia principalis*, though the precise meaning of the word is in doubt. Rome was indisputably the chief apostolic see of the world. But thence *sacerdotalis unitas exorta est*: how could this be? In Cyprian's language *sacerdos* is always equivalent to *episcopus*, and we know exactly what he took to be the source of the united episcopate. It was the original mission of St. Peter. Rome had nothing to do with that. But on the other hand the intimate connexion of St. Peter with the Roman Church was a commonplace for Cyprian, and if on this account he called it in some special sense *cathedra Petri*, he might speak of it rhetorically as the fountain-head of unity. Turning now to an earlier letter, I find him saying that Cornelius was elected Bishop of Rome, "cum Fabiani

[1] Ep. 59. 14.

locus, id est, cum locus Petri et gradus cathedrae sacerdotalis uacaret."[1] Cornelius succeeded Peter just as he succeeded Fabian, and he succeeded him in the episcopal seat. The *locus Petri* might naturally be called *cathedra Petri*. It would seem, then, that *cathedra Petri* is a synonym for the *ecclesia principalis* of Rome.

In that case you may observe from this letter that the African bishops stand to the Bishop of Rome exactly as the other Apostles stood to Peter, "pari consortio praediti et honoris et potestatis." For Cyprian indignantly resented the notion that the malcontents could find a higher authority at Rome than in Africa. They had been condemned in Africa: "Iam causa eorum cognita est, iam de eis dicta sententia est." It was monstrous for them to be running about over sea and disturbing the harmony of the united episcopate, "nisi si paucis desperatis et perditis minor uidetur esse auctoritas episcoporum in Africa constitutorum."

Cyprian was evidently troubled in mind about this desperate attempt of abandoned men to set up an authority at Rome superior to his own at Carthage. Cornelius appeased and

[1] Ep. 55. 8.

satisfied him, but the trouble became acute when Stephen succeeded to the Roman See, and the controversy about the baptism of heretics broke out. Cyprian's ally in this dispute, Firmilian of Caesarea, wrote with fierce sarcasm of the "stultitia" of Stephen, "qui sic de episcopatus sui loco gloriatur et se successionem Petri tenere contendit," and "qui per successionem cathedram Petri habere se praedicat."[1] It is evident that Stephen claimed a superior dignity, at least, on two grounds; because of the majesty of Rome, and because he held an apostolic see in direct succession from Peter. The claim was resented both in East and West, by Firmilian and by Cyprian; the resistance of Firmilian is the more interesting since it was he who gave the first blow to the prestige of the apostolic See of Antioch also, presiding in the council which deposed Paul of Samosata. But these protests themselves show what ideas were current, and if the letter to Cornelius stood alone we should certainly say that Cyprian called the Roman See *cathedra Petri* because of its special apostolicity.

[1] Cypr. Epp. 75. 17. The letter, as it appears among those of St. Cyprian, is a literal translation from the Greek original.

But we must look further. Not only did Cyprian maintain the complete equality of his own See of Carthage with that of Rome, but he connected this also with Peter. Writing to the faithful about the schismatics who disturbed the interior peace of the Church of Carthage during his exile, he said :

> Deus unus est et Christus unus et una ecclesia et cathedra una super Petrum Domini uoce fundata.[1]

Here is the very thesis of the treatise *De Unitate*. Not only is there one sole bishop in Carthage, who is the necessary centre of unity in that Church, but this single episcopate rests upon a larger unity. We know what this larger unity is ; it is the unity of the whole episcopate, and this derives its unity from the original mission of Peter as the one first Apostle. Therefore the episcopal chair of Carthage is founded on Peter.

One asks whether *cathedra Petri* and *cathedra super Petrum fundata* can have meant the same thing in Cyprian's mouth. If now we turn back to the text B of the treatise *De Unitate*, and suppose it to be the genuine writing of Cyprian, an affirmative answer

[1] Ep. 43. 5. The reading *petram* is of inferior authority.

seems to be imperatively required. He is there dealing with this same trouble of schism within the local Church, and he deals with it throughout in the same way. The principle of unity is traced from Peter through the whole apostolate to the episcopate as a whole, and so to the bishop of each several Church. The chain is complete. At either end is an individual centre of unity; there is none other between. From the one Peter to the one bishop the progress is through corporate unity. If in the course of this argument Cyprian says that he "qui cathedram Petri super quam fundata ecclesia est deserit," cannot be counted in the Church, it is clear that *cathedra Petri* means the authority given to Peter, which is shared *pari potestate* by all the Apostles, by the whole episcopate, and by every several bishop; for every bishop holds it, he says, *in solidum*. It follows that *cathedra Petri* stands for episcopal authority, just as in the Gospel *cathedra Moysi* stands for the authority of the Sanhedrim.

Will this interpretation fit the phrase where it occurs in the letter to Cornelius? We must remember the indignation with which Cyprian was writing. The word *audent* should

be noticed. The schismatics were doing an audacious thing in going over sea to Rome. Condemned by their own bishops, they were seeking rehabilitation elsewhere. The meaning may be that they were looking abroad for that *cathedra Petri* which they despised at home, and sought it in the leading apostolic see. We shall then read some irony in the words; they will represent the plea put forward by the malcontents themselves, "desperatis et perditis," the plea that the *cathedra Petri* was somehow more in evidence at Rome than elsewhere. This passage will then adjust itself to the scornful words of Firmilian about Stephen's use of the same phrase. It is not impossible, if the text B be really from the hand of Cyprian, that he wrote it thus in the first instance, and afterwards withdrew it precisely because of this abuse of the term *cathedra Petri*, substituting that text A which passed more generally and is found in almost all the older copies of his treatise. [1]

It seems to me, then, probable that in the

[1] There is one piece of internal evidence pointing to the priority of text B. The words *hanc et Pauli unitatem, etc.*, lead naturally to the concluding sentence *quando et beatus apostolus Paulus, etc.*, which text A brings in abruptly without any preparation.

mouth of St. Cyprian *cathedra Petri* meant the authority of the episcopate. If the bishops of Rome and Antioch were in a peculiar sense successors of St. Peter, every individual bishop was equally the representative of St. Peter in his own Church, and sat in St. Peter's seat. Are there any traces of the observance of the festival of the Chair in this sense?

There are traces. The festival was not observed in Africa, and therefore there is no authentic sermon of St. Augustine bearing on it, but two were assigned to it in the older editions of his works.[1] The second of these is an ordinary discourse about St. Peter's walking on the sea, without any reference to the feast of the Chair. The other sermon mentions the feast expressly, and now provides the lessons of the second nocturn for February 22nd in the Roman Breviary. This may be quoted:

> Institutio solemnitatis hodiernae a senioribus nostris Cathedrae nomen accepit, ideo quod primus Apostolorum Petrus hodie episcopatus cathedram suscepisse referatur. Recte ergo Ecclesiae natalem sedis illius colunt, quam Apostolus pro Ecclesiarum salute suscepit, dicente Domino: Tu es Petrus, et super hanc petram aedificabo Ecclesiam

[1] *Serm. de Sanctis*, xv and xvj. In the Benedictine edition, *App.*, pp. 190–92.

meam. Petrum itaque fundamentum Ecclesiae Dominus nominauit; et ideo digne fundamentum hoc Ecclesia colit, supra quod ecclesiastici aedificii altitudo consurgit. . . . Quod natalis ergo Cathedrae hodie colitur, sacerdotale honoratur officium. Sibi hoc Ecclesiae inuicem praestant, quia tanto necesse plus habet Ecclesia dignitatis, quanto sacerdotale officium plus honoris.[1]

The sermon goes on to lament the continuance of the pagan custom of making offerings to the dead on this day, which is thus identified with February 22nd. A canon of the Council of Tours, held in A.D. 567, condemns the same practice, "in festivitate cathedrae domni Petri apostoli," and with this the homily may possibly have some connexion. However that may be, the text shows that in the neighbourhood, and at the date of its delivery, the festival was not related to the establishment of St. Peter at Rome, but to the original establishment of the apostolate, and consequently of the episcopate, in his person. It was held in honour of the *sacerdotale officium* in general. This was probably not invariable. In a Roman calendar of the year A.D. 336 it is entitled *Natale Petri de cathedra*; and

[1] I quote the text as it stands in the Roman Breviary. The Benedictine editors read: "Sibi hoc ecclesiae praestant quibus necesse est ut tanto plus habeant dignitatis quanto sacerdotale officium plus honoris."

Duchesne infers a specific relation to the feast of June 29th, which was the anniversary of the translation of the relics of the Apostles to the cemetery *ad Catacumbas* in the year A.D. 258. At this period the anniversaries of the election and burial of each bishop were celebrated as his *natale* and *depositio*.[1] If this inference be correct, the Apostle may have been commemorated as first Bishop of Rome, and the *cathedra* would then be the local see. That was perhaps the case at Rome, but the sermon before us shows that when the observance was extended to other regions —the words *sibi hoc ecclesiae inuicem praestant* should be noted—it was referred rather to the foundation of the apostolic order, and *cathedra Petri* stood for the universal authority of the episcopate. Gregory of Tours mentions the festival, in a list of those observed by his own Church, as *Natale Sancti Petri episcopatus*,[2] a title which may be taken either way, but which suits the original mission better than the settlement of the Apostle at Rome. For St. Jerome, when he wrote his youthful letter to Damasus about the Antiochene schism, it is

[1] Duchesne, *Origines*, p. 266 (E.T., p. 277).
[2] *Hist. Franc.* x. 31.

clear that *cathedra Petri* meant the apostolic see,[1] and this was probably the usual style of the Roman Church. That is true also, I think, of Optatus of Mileum, who, in his controversy with the Donatists, relied mainly on the fact that the Catholics of Africa were in communion with the Bishops of Rome in lineal succession from St. Peter; but in his curious phrase *cathedra Petri quae nostra est* there seems to be an echo of the language of St. Cyprian, and this appears even more clearly in his remark about the secession of Maiorinus from the *cathedra Petri uel Cypriani.*[2] Augustine reproduced the argument of Optatus in the ballad which he wrote soon after his conversion; but, in his own conduct of the controversy, he made much less use than might be expected of the authority of Rome, and I have not found the phrase *cathedra Petri* anywhere in his writings. His comparison of the "cathedra ecclesiae Romanae in qua Petrus sedit et in qua hodie Anastasius sedet," with that of the Church of Jerusalem, "in qua Iacobus sedit et in qua hodie Ioannes sedet,"[3] does not show how he

[1] *Ep.* 15. [2] *De Schism. Donat.* i. 10; ii. 9.
[3] *Contr. Lit. Petil.* ii. 51.

would have employed it. The general use was ultimately settled in the Roman sense, but it seems probable that St. Cyprian gave the phrase a wider significance, and that in Gaul, where the influence of the African Church was very great, his use lingered for some centuries.

APPENDIX B

SECURUS IUDICAT ORBIS TERRARUM

THE historic stomach-ache from which Newman suffered after reading Wiseman's article in the *Dublin Review* during the summer of the year 1839 is a valuable index showing the real state of his mind. We must not rely exclusively on what he wrote nearly thirty years later in his *Apologia*; the reminiscences which he poured out in hot and righteous indignation, without any consultation of documents, were inevitably coloured by the experiences of the intervening period, and they can in some cases be checked and corrected by contemporary letters. In this case the blow was certainly sharper and more sudden than it seemed to him in retrospect; the homely metaphor in which he expressed his feeling tells a truth which was obscured for him when long afterwards he wrote his memories of that fateful year, and

said that on reading the article he "did not see much in it." The argument, no doubt, was not new to him; a reference to his previous writings shows that he had already paid much attention to the Donatist controversy, and its value as illustrating modern disputes. Notwithstanding this, he remembered how he had been struck by the words *Securus iudicat orbis terrarum*, how they kept ringing in his ears, how they worked upon him like the "Turn again, Whittington" of the chime of Bow bells, or like the "Tolle, lege—Tolle lege" of the children's game which brought Augustine to the crisis of his conversion. I observe, however, that it was just these four words, detached from their context, which clung to his memory; and this fact is significant. It shows what was the lasting impression. Wiseman quoted them in their context; in their context Newman read them, and felt sick. It is with their context that they must be considered, if we would understand why they so affected him.

> Quapropter securus iudicat orbis terrarum bonos non esse qui se diuidunt ab orbe terrarum, in quacunque parte terrarum.

I must suppose that Newman was not con-

tent with reading even so much, but examined the whole context in which the sentence occurs. For it was a new quotation ; so far as I am aware, it had never before been used in controversy ; it was not familiar, and the indexers of St. Augustine's works had not fastened upon it. Wiseman, or his printer, unfortunately gave a wrong reference, but this was not far out, and the place could easily be found. Newman must surely have read through at least that third book *Contra Epistulam Parmeniani* in which the passage occurs. There is, perhaps, nothing in literature more dreary than the treatises of the Donatist controversy; but a man far less sensitive than Newman would wade deep to get the true sense of a saying which he found so impressive.

What, then, would he discover ? He would find that the recurrent words of the treatise, which reappear in this summary conclusion and determine its meaning, are *securus* and *bonos* and *se diuidunt* : somewhat less dominant is the phrase *orbis terrarum*. He would carefully note the particular Donatist contention which Augustine was combating. It was the contention that good men are bound to

withdraw from communion with evil men, and must come out of the congregation of the wicked lest they be partakers of their sins, that the chaff must be winnowed from the grain, that this had been done by them, and that the following of Donatus was the resultant pure church. Therefore it was the one true Church of Christ in Africa. Their opponents had tolerated the wickedness of Caecilian, and were cut off from Christ. Moreover, throughout all the rest of the world the bishops communicated with the followers of Caecilian, and so were partakers of his sins; therefore, all were cut off; the Donatists of Africa were the one and only remnant of the true Catholic Church; they were, in fact, the Catholic Church, and all others were heretics or schismatics; there might be some faithful ones scattered here and there who held with them, as we know there was a little congregation at Rome which procured for itself a Donatist bishop; but the historic sees beyond the limits of the African provinces were apostate.

How did Augustine answer this contention? In two ways. First, he asserted boldly—almost temerariously—that the power of ex-

communication must be used sparingly. He referred to the parable of the tares and the wheat. What is the peril of rooting up the wheat with the tares? It is the peril of including some good and faithful men among the wicked who are cast out. But more than this: it is the peril also of doing even greater harm than is done by the toleration of wickedness. The toleration which he advocated is of a remarkable kind. Excommunication must be attempted, he says, only where it will not cause danger of schism:

> In hac uelut angustia quaestionis non aliquid nouum aut insolitum dicam, sed quod sanitas obseruat ecclesiae, ut cum quisque fratrum, id est, Christianorum intus in ecclesiae societate constitutorum, in aliquo tali peccato fuerit deprehensus ut anathemate dignus habeatur, fiat hoc ubi periculum schismatis nullum est.

There will be grave peril of schism, he suggests, if those who are condemned have many supporters within the Church:

> Tunc autem hoc sine labe pacis et unitatis, et sine laesione frumentorum fieri potest, cum congregationis ecclesiae multitudo ab eo crimine quod anathematizatur aliena est.

Is this a cowardly yielding to mere numbers? He urges that the correction of the wayward must be so administered, "ut possit omnibus

dignissima uideri quae in eum fuerit anathematis prolata sententia." Recalling the words of St. Paul about the Corinthian penitent, "Sufficient to such an one is this punishment which was inflicted by the many," he comments:

> Neque enim potest esse salubris a multis correptio, nisi cum ille corripitur qui non habet sociam multitudinem. Cum uero idem morbus plurimos occupauerit, nihil aliud bonis restat quam dolor et gemitus.

Evils must be endured with sorrow and sighing, if they are so widespread and so deeply rooted that the attempt to remedy them by severity would rend the Church in twain. The time of harvest must then be awaited. And such difficulties are inevitable. The Church will not be all pure, as the Donatists with little enough reason pretended to be, until after the winnowing of the last judgement.

In the second place, he pressed against the Donatists an *argumentum ad hominem*. Their principle notoriously led to continual divisions among themselves, producing mutual excommunication; how could they be certain that they were not in some cases communicating with the wrong party and separating them-

selves from the good? Their only security lay in the assumption that all who separated from them proved themselves by that very act of separation to be no good men:

> Unde securi sunt, nisi quia certum habent bonos esse non potuisse, qui se ab unitate communionis Donati, quae per totam Africam diffunditur, segregarunt?

This position he turns upon them by showing that the rest of the Church, spread throughout the whole world, judges them exactly as they judge their own dissidents, and with better reason. The whole world judges with perfect confidence that those who separate themselves from the whole world are no good men.

Such is the argument out of which Wiseman quarried this last sentence to be a stone of stumbling for Newman. Why did Newman suffer so much in consequence? Why that stomach-ache? I could imagine him reading the whole context carefully, and then replying—with infinitely more grace and vigour, of course, and with incomparably finer irony—somewhat as follows:

"But, Dr. Wiseman, the boot is on the other leg. It is not we who resemble the Donatists; it is you and your friends at Rome. We poor Tractarians do not pretend that our

Church is pure and spotless ; on the contrary, we habitually describe it as a penitent Church, deservedly suffering many woes and privations ; but you and your friends are inclined to resent a suggestion that you need any reform. We do not, like the Donatists, rebaptize people coming to us from other parts of the Church ; but you make a practice of doing this, even if not a rule. We do not hastily excommunicate evil men, at the risk of schism ; on the contrary, we are accused, with some reason, of laxity in this regard, and we excommunicate hardly anybody ; but you are stern and peremptory, not, indeed, in judging moral faults, for which I confess you show a large toleration, but in dealing with faults of discipline and minor aberrations from the truth ; you may remember that the excommunication of Michael Cerularius precipitated a schism which still continues after eight centuries, and that Pius V excommunicated Elizabeth of England with consequences over which his successor Urban VIII declared that he wept tears of blood. We do not pretend—though we have a sufficiently good opinion of ourselves—that the Churches of these English provinces alone retain the true faith and

discipline of Christ, and therefore form the whole Catholic Church ; but you, if I mistake not, make precisely that claim for your communion. We do not ostentatiously separate ourselves from communion with the Church throughout the rest of the world ; on the contrary, we sometimes betray a rather pathetic desire to be admitted to such communion ; but you and yours are very exclusive, showing little or no desire to communicate either with us or with Greeks or Russians ; perhaps you may remember also, though you are now numerous and prosperous, that in the eleventh century, when that decisive and divisive stand was made against the Greeks, the distracted Western Churches counted for hardly more as against the flourishing East than the African Churches of the fourth century counted for as against the rest of Christendom. Forgive me, Dr. Wiseman, but I think the stomach-ache is yours. Physician, heal thyself."

Why could not Newman make some such reply as this ? It must have been because he was conscious of having the temper of Donatism in himself. For it was the temper, not the circumstances, of the Donatists that Augustine was rebuking, and it is the temper that matters.

It cannot be denied that the temper of Donatism has been abundantly illustrated in the English Church during the last three centuries. It inspired much of the old-fashioned talk about our incomparable Liturgy. It peeps out in references to "that pure and reformed part of Christ's Holy Catholic Church to which we belong," though, to be sure, the word "part" repels it. In William Palmer's *Treatise of the Church* there are pages where it seems to be rampant. Wiseman probably had things of this sort in mind when he launched his missile. Was it merely through a misunderstanding of the circumstances that he took aim specially at the Tractarians? I think not. He probably remembered his interview with Newman and Hurrell Froude at Rome in 1833, and was shrewd enough to understand their attitude. At all events, the missile found its mark; it hit Newman, as we know, in a delicate part, and crumpled him up. Why? The other Tractarians seem to have been unaffected. There is no mention of this critical occurrence in Pusey's correspondence; it is evident that both he and Keble were strangers to Newman's fears of the following months, and could not make out what was

happening to him. Newman alone was struck, and he must therefore have been struck for some personal reason.

I turn back to that interview at Rome. The Tracts, be it remembered, were not yet begun; the two Oxonians were despondent about the present state and the future prospects of the English Church, and they were deeply impressed by the majesty of Rome. Almost at the same time Mr. Gladstone was paying his first visit to Rome, was feeling the same impression, and under the great brooding dome of St. Peter's was devoting himself to work for the union of Christendom. But Newman and Froude were affected in another way. Their interview with Wiseman at the English College should be studied, not only as it appears through the mist of time in the *Apologia*, but also as it was described by Froude in his letters. It is evident that the two friends were already making the tacit assumption, on which Wiseman afterwards relied, that the Roman communion was in some sense the Church of the *orbis terrarum*, and that they themselves stood outside in separation. Why did they not enter? They wished to do so; they made definite proposals

to Wiseman, asking on what terms they could be admitted. Froude was angered by the reply, and expressed his feelings with characteristic vehemence. "We got introduced to him," he wrote to a friend, "to find out whether they would take us in on any terms to which we could twist our consciences, and we found to our dismay that not one step could be gained without swallowing the Council of Trent as a whole." Newman said that Froude was made "a staunch Protestant" by the rebuff, but his friend denied this as "a most base calumny," though he admitted that he was deeply moved. "It has altogether changed my notions of the Roman Catholics," he wrote, "and made me wish for a total overthrow of their system. I think that the only τόπος now is 'the ancient Church of England,' and, as an explanation of what one means, Charles the First and the Nonjurors." Observe the sectarianism of all this; here is precisely the Donatist temper. Newman, for his part, showed in his correspondence that what held him off was the offence of Roman "corruptions," doctrinal and practical. The effect is seen in his theory of the Via Media, and in his fierce onslaughts on Romanism. He was

fierce because he felt that these things were separating him from the greater part of Christendom; but the separation was determined by his own will. That is not exactly the Donatist temper, which rather rejoices in separation, but it is not far removed. Newman was conscious of the difficulties of his position. In his *Home Thoughts from Abroad*, written in the spring of 1836, he shows how he was grappling with them. He makes one disputant say, "Surely there is such a religious *fact* as the existence of a great Catholic body, union with which is a Christian privilege and duty. Now we English are separate from it." And again: "I am only contending for the fact that the communion of Rome constitutes the main body of the Catholic Church, and that we are split off from it, and in the condition of the Donatists." The other disputant calls attention to the obvious fact that the Roman communion is not the whole Church, but grounds his defence mainly on the departure of Rome from Primitive Christianity, "the practical idolatry, the virtual worship of the Virgin and Saints, which are the offence of the Latin Church, and the degradation of moral truth and duty which

follows from them"; and so he concludes that "we cannot join a Church which allows such things."

That again, if both sides of the disputation be read together, is not exactly the Donatist temper, for no true Donatist would ever acknowledge that his communion was anything less than the whole Church, but it comes very near. The separation is admitted, and defended. We must separate ourselves, however reluctantly, from the evil which the Great Church tolerates. We must withdraw, says Newman in effect, from communion with it, even at the cost of a desolating schism.

It was no wonder that Wiseman's bomb shattered his confidence. *Securus iudicat orbis terrarum.* He was deliberately separating himself from what practically represented the whole world, and that on the ground of his own superior virtue. The whole world with serene confidence condemned his assumption, and denied the pretence of goodness which could so act. The wonder is that he did not forthwith submit. But he was so constituted that he must first persuade himself to tolerate the corruptions which were his stumbling-block. He was soon working at the Essay on

Development, and he was satisfied. Meanwhile Pusey and Keble could not make out what was the matter. Their profound humility, and their whole reasoned conception of the Church, made the Donatist temper a thing incomprehensible to them. Their consciences were not touched by what must have seemed to them a fantastic comparison. I doubt whether they ever did understand what it was that tore their friend from them. The truth is that he had never been with them.

Printed by A. R. Mowbray & Co. Ltd., London and Oxford

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

THE MYSTERIES OF GRACE

Cloth, 1/- net.

Alcuin Club Prayer Book Revision Pamphlets.

LITURGICAL INTERPOLATIONS AND THE REVISION OF THE PRAYER BOOK

Paper, 6*d.* net; Paper boards, cloth backs, 1/- net.

CONSCIOUSNESS OF GOD

Two Lectures on the Antecedents of Salvation.

Cloth, 1/- net.

THE WISDOM OF THE SIMPLE

Being the Golden Sayings of Giles of Assisi.

Translated by the Rev. T. A. LACEY, M.A. Velvet leather, 1/- net.

The Interior Life, and other Addresses

By the Rev. GEORGE CONGREVE, M.A., of the Society of S. John the Evangelist, Cowley. Cloth, 5/- net.

"Like all that Father Congreve writes, this book is full of the peculiar strength of the disciplined religious life in its special sense; it is the product of a mind really trained in religion, and is marked by the charm and distinction which are the writer's own individual and characteristic gifts."—*Church Times.*

Life and Times of Nicholas Ferrar

By H. P. K. SKIPTON. Fifteen Illustrations. Cloth, 2/6 net.

"Passage after passage of his introductory chapter shows how thoroughly, by study and the power of entering into the past, he is immersed in the atmosphere of the period and the religion in which Nicholas Ferrar moved."—*Guardian.*

A. R. MOWBRAY & CO. LTD., LONDON AND OXFORD

A Life of John Cosin, Bishop of Durham, 1660–72

By the Rev. PERCY H. OSMOND, M.A. With Eight Collotype Illustrations. Cloth, 8/6 net.

"A creditable attempt to fill up a gap in ecclesiastical biography with a memoir, for which his published works and correspondence provide abundance of material, of the munificent, learned, and masterful Restoration Bishop of Durham."—*Times.*

The Use of Penitence

By the late Right Rev. EDWARD T. CHURTON, D.D. Second Edition largely revised. Edited by the Rev. Darwell Stone, D.D., Principal of Pusey House. Cloth, 6/- net.

"This book was so thoroughly revised and in large part re-written by the author before his death that it is practically a new work. It has had, too, the inestimable advantage of being seen through the press by Dr. Darwell Stone. The book was valuable when it was first published; it is more valuable now. As Dr. Stone says in his introduction, 'The Bishop brought to the task of writing it, not only his definite scholarship, his refined and cultivated mind, his real learning, his large experience, but also a true pastor's love for souls.'"—*Church Times.*

Our Companion by the Way

Retreat Addresses.

By the Rev. W. F. LA TROBE-BATEMAN, M.A. Seventh Edition. Cloth, 1/- net.

"This little volume of Retreat Addresses is full of the true retreat atmosphere. . . . Many will be grateful to Mr. Bateman for allowing these addresses to appear."—*Guardian.*

A. R. MOWBRAY & CO. LTD., LONDON AND OXFORD

Glimpses of the Past

Reminiscences by ELIZABETH WORDSWORTH, First Principal of Lady Margaret Hall, Oxford. With Eight Illustrations. New and Cheaper Edition. Cloth, 2/6 net.

"The artlessness of the whole is quite captivating, and there is plenty of interest to allure those who have an interest in remarkable people for their own sake."—*Times.*

"The subjects touched in her reminiscences are as various as the often well-known figures of whom she paints fresh portraits."—*Spectator.*

What, then, is the Gospel?

By the Rev. J. H. B. MACE, M.A. With a Foreword by the Rev. Henry Scott Holland, D.D. Cloth, 2/6 net.

"It is a really excellent thesis on S. Paul's attitude towards the Gospel story and doctrine as evidenced in the risen living Christ, and illuminating the life of the Christian."—*Academy.*

Creative Revelation.

Four Lectures on the Miraculous Christ.

By the Rev. J. G. SIMPSON, D.D., Canon and Precentor of S. Paul's. Cloth, 2/- net.

One outcome of Mr. Thompson's notorious volume *Miracles in the New Testament* was a series of lectures given by Dr. Simpson to the members of the S. Paul's Lecture Society, and these lectures, as now issued in permanent form, should reach a wide circle of readers. Dr. Simpson is concerned with Mr. Thompson's two main contentions, and his searching criticism is a bold contrast to "the sort of mechanical apologetic for miracle which too often does duty for a real discussion of the subject."

"Dr. Simpson writes with strong conviction allied to a deep and broad sympathy with honest doubts and fears. His book is one for clergy and laity alike, and should find its way into the hands of all who are perplexed by the spirit of modern criticism."—*Academy.*

A. R. MOWBRAY & CO. LTD., LONDON AND OXFORD